

PROPR. OF  
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY  
RECEIVED SEP 12 1945

# THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW

EDITOR: LESLIE F. CHURCH, B.A., Ph.D.

JULY 1945

Price 2s. 6d.

## CONTENTS:

### ARTICLES

- The Christian Witness in the Post-War World, by Bernard E. Jones, M.A., B.D.
- The Triumph of Anthony Trollope, by W. Bardsley Brash, M.A., B.Litt., B.D.
- France and Ourselves, by Herbert L. Bishop
- The Rider of the Long Trail: An Appreciation of Francis Asbury, by S. Parkes Cadman, contributed by George Growcott
- In the Wilderness, by Charles F. Davey, M.A., B.D.
- Spiritual Life and Literary Trends, by J. Henry Bodenham, M.A.
- Man and his Freedom, by Professor E. L. Allen
- The Philosophy of Bernard Shaw, by Robert Hamilton

### NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

- The Gospel and Society, by E. C. Urwin, M.A., B.D.
- God in History, by Douglas W. Lewis, D.D.
- 'The Story of my Life', by J. E. Rattenbury, D.D.
- Jane and Charlotte, by W. S. Handley Jones

### EDITORIAL COMMENTS, by Leslie F. Church, B.A., Ph.D.

### MINISTERS IN COUNCIL, by W. E. Farndale

### RECENT LITERATURE FROM MY NEW SHELF

Edited by Dr. C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.

LONDON  
EPWORTH PRESS  
EDGAR C. BARTON  
25-35 CITY ROAD • E.C. I







# The London Quarterly and Holborn Review

JULY, 1945

## THE CHRISTIAN WITNESS IN THE POST-WAR WORLD

ONE of the most discussed problems in the Church today is the question of the place of the Church and the Ministry in the post-war world. What place has the Church in the rebuilding of society? How far can the Church enter the political arena? Can a Christian support a political party whose programme is not fully Christian? Ought the Church to enter the field with a political programme of its own? It is the purpose of this paper to elucidate the Christian position and to suggest a solution.

Christianity is not an ethical system or a programme of social reform, but a Gospel. It is a proclamation of the facts about the life and death of Jesus Christ, and an interpretation of those facts. Inherently bound up with this message is the proclamation of the Kingdom of God, which Jesus came to herald. The Kingdom of God for the early Christians was not a programme of social reform as it became in the nineteenth century, it was a present reality. 'For the Kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost' (Romans xiv. 17). In the Kingdom of God, God is King, and men enter the Kingdom of God when they come into the right relationship with God. The New Testament describes this right relationship as being 'in Christ a new creature', as being 'sons' of God, but however it is described it means the acceptance of God as He offers Himself to mankind in Jesus Christ.

In a kingdom there are at least two relationships, that of citizen to King, and that of citizen to citizen. It is so in the Kingdom of God. The first commandment of Jesus must always be supreme, but the second commandment is 'like unto it' and cannot be separated from the first. The new relationship with God is expressed in love of neighbour. John says, 'Beloved, if God so loved us, we also ought to love one another' (1 John iv. 11). Thus any ethical principles, which we call Christian, may be essential to the very nature of Christianity, but they are only secondary to, and derivative from, the fundamental of Christianity, which is the new relationship between man and God. The slogan of the Christian Commando Campaigns is 'New Men for a New World', which, we are told, must be interpreted in the light of 'If any man be in Christ he is a new creature'. Men are made 'new' by God through Jesus Christ; the world can only be made 'new' as Christians express their faith in social life.

If this new relationship is the fundamental of Christianity it follows that the first and foremost task of the Church is to preach the Gospel — the 'kerugma'

of the early Church. It was not the preaching of the Sermon on the Mount that added thousands to the early Church, but the preaching of Jesus. 'The preaching of the Cross is to them that perish foolishness, but unto us which are saved, it is the power of God' (1 Corinthians i. 18). 'We preach Christ crucified' (1 Corinthians i. 23). 'Philip went down to the city of Samaria and preached Christ unto them' (Acts viii. 5). 'Then Philip preached unto him Jesus' (Acts viii. 35). Paul 'preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection' (Acts xvii. 18). The Church's task is to offer men Jesus Christ.

Has the Church then no task of preaching the Sermon on the Mount? God forbid! But the Church and the Christian Minister must guard against the temptation of preaching the Sermon on the Mount and forgetting the Gospel. For there is no such thing as a 'Christian Ethic' apart from the Christian Gospel. Dr. Manson reminds us of this truth.

The notion that we can wander at will through the teaching of Jesus as through a garden, plucking here and there an ethical flower to weave a chaplet for the adornment of our own philosophy of life, is an idea which is doomed to disappointment, for the nature of plucked flowers is to wither. The ethical maxims of Jesus, abstracted from the religion out of which they grow, become mere counsels of perfection which we may indeed respectfully admire, but which have no immediate reference to the affairs of our ordinary life.<sup>1</sup>

We can separate the ethical teaching of Jesus but when we have done so what we have got is not Christianity in its fullness.

On the other hand we must not separate the Gospel from the Sermon on the Mount. They go together. However fully a man may attain to membership of a Kingdom which is not of this world, he must still live in this world. If his life is to be integrated, his membership of the heavenly Kingdom must show itself in the way he lives in this world. The good life is not just an incidental part of being a Christian; it is the inevitable product of the Christian faith. The Kingdom is the seed; the life of perfect love is the fruit. So Paul insists that there should not only be the signs of the Spirit in the gifts of tongues and prophecy, but the fruits of the Spirit in love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith; meekness and temperance must be shown also.

The disciples at Antioch were first called 'Christians' because there was something different about their way of life. There should always be a contrast between the ordinary pagan or non-Christian morality and the morality of those within the Kingdom. The crucial question for Christians is, 'What do ye more than others?' There are the 'Two Moralities', which A. D. Lindsay describes so well. There is (i) the morality of 'My station and its duties', or 'playing the game', and (ii) the morality of the Sermon on the Mount. The second has no meaning without the first. Going the second mile would be meaningless, if the ordinary morality did not say that we must go one. The morality of the Sermon on the Mount presupposes the ordinary morality. Unfortunately some Christians think they are doing their duty if they obey the

<sup>1</sup> *Teaching of Jesus* (Cambridge University Press), p. 266.

dictates of ordinary morality, and consider 'the extra mile' as merely optional. For the non-Christian it is optional, but for the Christian it is the command of his Lord. To quote Lindsay again:

If we do not love God as God is revealed to us in the life and teaching of Jesus, then we are not disciples of Christ, and the Sermon on the Mount lays no obligation upon us. For the Sermon on the Mount does not say, This is how people ought to be compelled or somehow induced to behave. It does not propose to offer any of us reasonable security that if we act in the way it prescribes we shall find plenty of other people keeping us company. It doesn't put us at all in the position where we are responsible only to other people as they are only responsible to us. . . . It puts us into direct relation to God, bids us consider, and then, for love, follow after the perfection of our Father in heaven.<sup>1</sup>

Here we have the essential truth of the Christian way of life. The teaching of Jesus is not an ethical system in the same sense as that of Aristotle or John Stuart Mill. It is not bound by custom and usage. It not only goes farther than the ordinary morality but it goes deeper. It is not concerned with actions so much as with attitudes of mind. Jesus not only condemns adultery but he condemns the lust. Hate is the root of murder, and so on. We are bound not merely by the letter of the law, but by the spirit. We have our rights, but there is to be no rigid insistence on them. Finally we are told that we must be perfect even as our heavenly Father is perfect.

Because the teaching of Jesus is not a closely defined system, there are many aspects of social life that have no specific mention in the Gospels. Jesus was calling men into the fellowship of God's family, and in the ethical teaching He is saying: 'This is how a child of God will behave in such and such circumstances. . . . Don't live by laws and rules. Remember you are a child of God. Live as a child of God in this world. Be perfect like your Father.' It would be much easier if we had a detailed list of rules for social behaviour, but we should not be children of a family, but rather slaves to a legal code. So in trying to find the solution to some of our social problems we should appeal to the spirit of the Gospel and general principles rather than to particular texts.

This lays us open to a further difficulty which cannot be avoided. Since in many instances we have no definite utterance of Jesus to guide us, each person has to decide for himself what is the Christian way in any given set of circumstances. Even the most sincere Christians may come to a different conclusion as, for instance, the Christian soldier and the Christian conscientious objector. This difficulty arises in personal behaviour, but it is more pronounced still when we come to find the Christian solution to problems of social action. If Christians seek the guidance of the Holy Spirit there should be a growing agreement as to the Christian way in social problems. But until such time as there is general agreement we need a Christian tolerance which is quite compatible with an enthusiasm for our own particular conviction. On controversial questions we need constantly to re-examine our position, seeking always the mind of Christ.

<sup>1</sup> *Moral Teaching of Jesus* (Hodder & Stoughton), p. 37f.

With this background we may now turn to the question of how the Christian Church is to solve the problems that arise through men living together in society.

1. The easiest thing to say is that we must convert everybody — but this ignores the fact that even converted souls are bound up with social bodies. Something more than conversion by itself is needed.

2. We might try to work out a Christian form of society, but we have seen something of the difficulties already. The teaching of Jesus just isn't a 'system'. As soon as we try to systematize it, as, for instance, Thomas Aquinas attempted, it ceases to be what the Sermon on the Mount is.

3. The third alternative is to act within the bounds and limitations of this present society, yet at the same time acting in this society in the light of the claims of the Kingdom of God. Because man is sinful, society is riddled with sin, and sometimes there is no *absolutely* Christian line of conduct. One action may appear to be infinitely nearer the way of Christ than another, and that action which is nearer the way of Christ is the *practical* Christian line of conduct, but neither may be *absolute*. So Professor Dodd gives us this warning:

In critical times like the present the Church is urged either to lend its support to one or another of the secular programmes for building a new world, or alternatively to enter the conflict with a competing programme of its own. It may indeed be the vocation of the individual Christian to work, and if need be to suffer, for one programme or another, according as he judges it to have in it something of the intention of the Gospel. He will bring it under the judgment of God, and take responsibility for it before Him. He will never identify any limited objective with the absolute which is the Kingdom of God; but, knowing that the empirical order belongs to God, he will work in it and upon it under the constraint of His Kingdom. The vocation of the Church, however, transcends all programmes.<sup>1</sup>

This applies to all Christians as citizens, to preachers as well as the ordinary Church member. The preacher, while not ceasing to be a prophet, needs to remember that his first task is the preaching of Jesus. Sometimes he is bound to enter the realm of social or political action and it is right that he should. But on matters of controversy he will do well to emphasize that what he is preaching is his conviction and not the general mind of the Church. He must beware of hobby-horses, and see that his chief boast is not in any particular social interpretation of the Gospel but in the Cross of Christ. On the political platform the preacher is as free as any other citizen, but he will be wise to make it clear that he is there as a citizen and not as representing the agreed mind of the Church.

This paper may well finish with a suggested list of principles which should be borne in mind as the Church faces the great tasks of the post-war world.

1. The first task of the Church is the preaching of the Gospel.
2. Christians must live in this present world, but in the light of the Kingdom of God. So, just as Jesus gave rules of conduct to help his followers, part of the ministry of the Church will be to give similar teaching. The need for the fruits of the Gospel in social life must be emphasized.

<sup>1</sup> *History and the Gospel* (Nisbet), p. 178.

3. Christians will be loyal citizens of their State as far as conscience allows. Christians will do their best to see that the institutions of the State work justly, and that their State acts justly in the world of States. This will not be enough by itself. They must seek by social reform to make a better State. In this respect there may be no ideal Christian economic, or Christian form of government. There are *Christians*, who have to make their own judgements, acting within society. Even when the outward form of society is improved Christians will still have to go the further mile, i.e. they will act better than the institutions demand of them.

4. Because a Christian is not bound merely by 'duty', he will be, if anything, more keen than others to take his place as a citizen in a democratic State. The Christian may be a member of a political party, which he deems to be nearest to his interpretation of the mind of Christ, but he must not confuse that party's programme with the Kingdom of God, nor the party conference with the Communion of Saints.

5. The Church as a body cannot enter the field as a political party. It is the Body of Christ working in a sinful world. The Pope, Archbishops, or Church Conferences can make pronouncements on specific social problems, but these will usually be concerned with general principles, on which there is little diversity of opinion within the Church.

6. As against this a preacher need not wait until the whole Church agrees with him before he speaks out on something laid upon his conscience. The Church has a prophetic function and it is the task of the Church to produce prophets. It may be the prophet's lot to be persecuted, but the Church will be well advised to follow Gamaliel.

7. The Church is a society, and as such should be a model for the wider community. We must make the Church a society in which corporate expression is given to the Christian ideals.

8. Because the Church must at times pronounce judgement on the secular scheme of things, and never has a merely national vision, it must as far as possible maintain its independence of the State.

BERNARD E. JONES

## THE TRIUMPH OF ANTHONY TROLLOPE

QUILLER-COUCH wrote in 1925: 'Anthony Trollope has received no gratitude of public recognition at all answerable to his deserts.' That verdict is not true of today. It is extremely difficult to obtain any of his novels, as the demand for them is phenomenal. A speaker on the wireless a few days ago referred to Trollope's 'tremendous popularity'. Radio dramatizations of *The Warden*, *Framley Parsonage*, *Barchester Towers*, *Doctor Thorne*, have been produced, and eagerly welcomed. How can we account for the Trollope boom and for his amazing 'come-back'? Michael Sadleir's brilliant book on Trollope, and the issue of a number of his novels in 'The World's Classics', did much toward a revival of interest in his works. The tide had turned some years before the war,

but that does not explain its now being in full flood. After his death he was known to most of his readers by his six Barsetshire novels, and by nothing else. Wise bookmen long before the war told us that we should read not only the Barsetshire stories, but also the political novels. By many of us the wise counsel was unheeded, but now we are soundly converted. We now read any novel of Trollope's on which we can lay our hands, and find in each and all of them the marks of the master story-teller.

Anthony Trollope was in his lifetime a most popular novelist. He was excelled in popularity by Dickens and Thackeray, but was not eclipsed by them. Then came his death (1882), and the issue of his *Autobiography* (1883), which slaughtered his reputation. In that book he told his readers that it was his custom 'to write with my watch before me, and to require for myself 250 words every quarter of an hour. I have found that my 250 words have been forthcoming as regularly as my watch went.' He worked three hours in the early morning, beginning his work at 5.30, and each day he wrote his 3000 words. He says: 'Beginning at that hour I could complete my literary work before I dressed for breakfast.' When he started a novel, he knew exactly how many words he meant to write, and the day on which the task would be ended. He served a long apprenticeship before he became a successful writer. 'Up to the end of 1857 I had received £55 for the hard work of ten years.' He was, nevertheless, undaunted. He wrote not only in his study, but also in the train. He tells us: 'I made for myself therefore a little tablet, and found after a few days' exercise that I could write as quickly in a railway carriage as I could at my desk.' He tells us that the greater part of *Barchester Towers* was written in this way. Trollope believed in work — hard and constant. As soon as he finished one book he began another. He writes: 'I always had my pen in my hand, whether crossing the seas, or fighting with American officials, or tramping about the streets of Beverley, I could do a little, and generally more than a little.' The reference to Beverley is interesting, for it refers to his unsuccessful parliamentary candidature as a Liberal in that constituency. Even amidst the hard toil and excitement of fighting an election he found time for his literary work.

He certainly devoted himself to his task. He tells us that, 'I was once told that the surest aid to the writing of a book was a piece of cobbler's wax on my chair. I certainly believe in the cobbler's wax much more than in inspiration.' Surely no one ever worked more doggedly. He says: 'More than nine-tenths of my literary work has been done in the last twenty years, during twelve of these years I followed another profession.' He never laid aside his task. He wrote *Lady Anna* during his voyage to Australia. 'I got to work the day after we left Liverpool, and before we reached Melbourne I had finished the story called *Lady Anna*'.

This frank confession of the *Autobiography* ruined his reputation. There arose a people who knew not Joseph, and despised Trollope because he seemed to them, by his own confessions, to be a mechanical drudge, a hodman of literature. It became the fashion to despise the Victorians, and especially Trollope, for he had made his own noose and hanged himself with it by writing his *Autobiography*. The whirligig of time has now brought its revenge, not on Trollope, but on his critics.

There are many reasons for his amazing popularity in these days of war. A

friend of mine on coming out of the theatre, where he had seen acted *Trouble in Barchester* (the dramatized version of *The Last Chronicle of Barset*) heard someone say, 'It takes you into another world'. There is much truth in that remark. Here is no war, no roar of aeroplanes, no bombs, no wild alarms. That is the negative truth. We also realize that he translates us into an absorbingly interesting world, where we meet one of the most lovable of clergymen, the Rev. Septimus Harding, the proud and militant churchman, Archdeacon Grantly, the interfering Mrs. Proudie, the unctuous and scheming Mr. Slope, and a host of other familiar characters. He not only introduces us to them; he also makes us dwell with them in their homes, and they become tinglingly alive. His novels can bear the test of the searching question in *Alice in Wonderland*: 'What is the use of a book without pictures and conversations?' We step on his magic carpet and we are in Barchester, or in the House of Commons, or in Mayfair, or wherever Trollope decides to whisk us. We mingle with his characters, and watch the moving panorama and listen to the conversation. It is all-so living and so vividly interesting. He was certainly true to his two maxims — 'A novel should give a picture of common life enlivened by humour and sweetened by pathos', 'A good novel should be realistic and sensational'. How well he succeeds in his aims!

Michael Sadleir says: 'Trollope was the most sensitive chronicler of everyday life in the history of English fiction.' He knows and loves England, and has carved out for us a new county — Barsetshire. He loves the institutions of his country, even when he so shrewdly criticizes them. He rightly claimed to have added another shire to England. He writes: 'Of *Framley Parsonage* I need only further say, that as I wrote it I became more closely than ever acquainted with the new shire which I had added to the English counties.' At the close of *The Last Chronicle of Barset* he wrote: 'To me Barset has been a real county, and its city a real city, and the spires and the towers have been before my eyes, and the voices of the people are known to my ears, and the pavements of the city ways are familiar to my footsteps.'

He was always — consciously and unconsciously — gathering material for his novels. From 1834-1867 (when he was 52) he was an official of the Post Office, travelling about the country improving the system of the delivery of letters — and watching and listening. The introduction of the pillar-box was his work. On one of his tours he travelled to Salisbury, and he who had no clerical connections watched the life of a cathedral city, and later gave to us the most intimate and vivid of all scenes from clerical life. In his journeys, and in his parliamentary campaign at Beverley, and at all times, he looked out on life with watchful and piercing eyes, and thus gained the material out of which he fashioned his novels. His books are alive because he — so vibrantly alive — takes his material from the life which he has seen and lived.

I asked a lady lately why she was so enthusiastic about Trollope's novels. She replied, 'Because he is so well-bred'. There is truth in that remark. His manners are so good. He has background, and a wide knowledge of life. He says, 'There is a propriety in things, and only by adherence to that propriety on the part of individuals can the general welfare be maintained'. He said of George Eliot as a writer that 'she lacks ease'. No one can lay that charge against him. Frederic Harrison speaks of Trollope's 'style of transparent ease',

and of its 'easy grace'. Trollope calls himself a preacher: 'I have ever thought of myself as a preacher of sermons and my pulpit as one which I could make salutary and agreeable to my audience.' Here is another reference to this: 'In writing novels we novelists preach to you from our pulpits, and are keenly anxious that our sermons shall not be ineffectual.' He looks upon his preaching with serious eyes: 'But the novelist, if he have a conscience, must preach his sermons with the same purpose as a clergyman, and must have his own system of ethics.' He often used his political novels to preach his political faith. He says: 'How frequently have I used them for the expression of my political and social convictions.'

He knows how to tell a story, and we love him for that. He always keeps to the true values. His villains are destroyed by their own villainies, his philanthropists are caught in the snares of their own duplicities, his true lovers gain the reward of their fidelity, even if the prize itself is not won, they are triumphant in the integrity of their character. He says of one of his characters — Lady Eustace — 'She was beginning to perceive that craft, let it be ever so crafty, will in the long run miss its mark. Lucy with her simplicity was stronger than she with her craft.' Trollope is as honest as a man can be, and is compact of shrewd common sense. No one has written more burning words about the evils of drunkenness, or of the blind folly of gambling. He describes a race-meeting as 'a congregation of all the worst blackguards of the country mixed with the greatest fools'. He has cleared his mind of cant, and refuses to call black white and white black. He writes of gamblers: 'They make everything cheap which should be dear, and everything dear that should be cheap.' He often denounces the feverish haste of men for wealth. He says, 'A man who gambles because he has money that he can afford to lose, is to my thinking a fool. But he who gambles because he has none, well, let us hope the best of him!'

Trollope is so tolerant. No novelist has more of this virtue. He shows folk as they are, reveals the worst, and then suddenly says to you, 'But he was not a bad man, for amidst all his failings he had certain virtues which must not be forgotten'. It is a benediction in days of war, when we are tempted to think of morals in only two degrees — black and white — to come under the spell of a writer of such wise and tolerant judgement. How delightful is his remark, 'When we want to do good to people, one has no right to expect that they shall understand it. It is like baptizing little children!' How wise are many of his sayings! Here are two about reading: 'If a man have not acquired the habit of reading till he be old, he shall sooner in his old age learn to make shoes than the adequate use of a book. And worse again: the making of shoes shall be more pleasant than the reading of a book'; 'No young man should dare to neglect literature. At some period of his life he will need consolation. And he may be certain that should he live to be an old man, there will be no other — except religion.'

How delightful are many of the women in Trollope's stories: Lady Glencora, so volatile, so generous, and so thoroughly charming; Mary Thorne with her freshness of youth, and her constancy in affection; Grace Crawley with her simplicity and pride, with a heart so rich in love in days both of sorrow and joy! How discriminating is his delineation of certain aristocrats, who think

seemingly more in terms of blood and of money than of worth, and yet when the true worth is revealed to them, open their hearts with full affection to receive those whom they had sought to repel, as do Lady Lufton, Archdeacon Grantly, the Duke of Omnium, and so many others. How brilliant is his portraiture of the Rev. Josiah Crawley, and how revealing is his remark about him: 'Mr. Crawley had now passed some ten years of his life in Hogglestock, and during those years he had worked very hard to do his duty, struggling to teach the people around him too much of the mystery, and something also of the comfort of religion.'

How confiding Trollope is! He chats so intimately with us. He tells us the secrets of his plots, and consults us as to the way they should develop. He asks our advice, but always takes his own way — the way of his genius. It is, nevertheless, delightful to remember that we have been asked, and that we have been taken into his workshop.

Nathaniel Hawthorne said of Trollope's novels — that they were 'as real as if some giant had hewn a great lump out of the earth and put it under a glass case, with all its inhabitants going about their daily business, and not suspecting that they were being made a show of. And these books are as English as a beef steak'. His scenes are 'so vivid, his characters so natural, and the conversations so real as to make us imagine that we are listening to the talk' — and it is all so English. William Cowper said that he loved 'talking letters'. Trollope makes his characters write many letters, and they are so real that we believe that they have not only been written, but also posted and read by the recipient. How beautiful is that letter written by the young Irish girl who is betrothed to Phineas Finn, but somewhat neglected by that popular politician! 'As long as I can have two or three dear, sweet, loving words, I shall be as happy as a queen. Ah! if you knew it all. But you never can know it all. A man has so many other things to learn that he cannot understand it.' Not only do his letters talk to us, but his art is so great that he makes the whole novel speak to us. He never talks down to us, but talks naturally and freely with us. There is a true trinity here of the story, author, and reader — three in one, and one in three.

How brilliant an etcher of a character he is, and how he loves his creations! Of Mrs. Proudie, whose ugly qualities he so clearly revealed, he writes, 'As for Mrs. Proudie, our prayers are that she may live for ever'. His prayers, we believe, will be answered, for surely she will ever live in literature. After he had depicted with such understanding art the death of Mrs. Proudie, he wrote, 'I have sometimes regretted the deed, so great was my delight in writing about Mrs. Proudie, so thorough was my knowledge of all the shades of her character'. After her death her ghost haunted him. He says, 'I have never disengaged myself from Mrs. Proudie, and still live much in company with her ghost'. He certainly lives with his characters — laughs with them, rebukes them, rejoices with them, and weeps with them. They are alive for him, and also for his readers. His delineation of character shows his penetrating understanding, and his portraits reveal his great skill as an artist.

As many of his characters appear in a series of novels which cover a period of many years, he is confronted with the difficult task of showing what remains constant and what changes with the passage of the years. This he does with conspicuous success. We see this in his masterly portrait of Plantagenet

Palliser, who becomes the Duke of Omnium. We see him as a young politician, as a Cabinet Minister, as Prime Minister; we watch him as lover, as husband, as father; we note how he faces triumph and disaster — and death; we see him as he grows old. We see, revealed in him, amidst all the changes of life, the dominance of the invincible motive of his life — his passionate desire to serve his country. We are made aware of his faults and prejudices — but always realize the high nobility of his character. Trollope rightly says of this character, 'I think that Plantagenet Palliser, Duke of Omnium, is a perfect gentleman. If he be not, then am I unable to describe a gentleman'. He certainly triumphed in his portraiture of this statesman of whom he wrote, 'He should have rank, and intellect, and parliamentary habits, by which to bind him to the service of his country; and he should also have unblemished, unextinguishable, inexhaustible love of country'.

Trollope had not high hopes of immortality as a novelist. He says, 'I do not think it probable that my name will remain among those who in the next century will be known as the writers of prose fiction — but if it does, that permanence of success will probably rest on the characters of Plantagenet Palliser, Lady Glencora, and the Rev. Mr. Crawley'. These three stand amongst his greatest creations of character. We should, however, like to place, on a 'short list' of his greatest characters, the name of that most lovable clergyman — Rev. Septimus Harding. To him Trollope pays this tribute: 'It was one trait of our old friend's character that he did nothing with parade. Mr. Harding had no state occasions. He was a good man without guile, believing humbly in the religion which he had striven to teach, and guided by the precepts which he had striven to learn.' He stands within the circle of a select band of beloved clergymen — with the poor parson of the town, with Dr. Primrose, with the bishop (in *Les Misérables*), with Parson Adams — men so different, and yet so truly one in a love which never fails.

Trollope was often somewhat too complex in his plots. He tells us that he did not regard the plot as of paramount interest. 'I think', he says, 'that the highest interest that a novel can have consists in perfect delineation of character, rather than in plot, or humour, or pathos.' He lived with his characters, and shared personally their adventures. He writes: 'I have wandered alone among the rocks and woods, crying at their grief, laughing at their absurdities, and thoroughly enjoying their joy.' He speaks of this again: 'I have lived with my characters, and thence has come whatever success I have obtained. There is a gallery of them, and of all in that gallery I may say that I know the tone of the voice, and the colour of the hair, every flaming of the eye, and the very clothes they wear.' He has certainly followed the advice he gave to a young writer: 'Beware of creating tedium.'

Trollope put a great deal into life, and took a great deal out of it. He says: 'The happiest man is he who, being above the trouble which money brings, has his hands full of work.' He has a zest for life, and he infuses it into his novels. Whatever he does — whether it be writing novels, hunting (for which he had such a great passion), post office work, etc. — he does it with all his might. He says: 'To be rich is not to have one or ten thousand a year, but to be able to get out of that one or ten thousand all that every pound, and shilling, and every penny, will give you.'

During the years of war Trollope has meant much to us. There are, of course, dreams which other writers have dreamed, and visions they have seen, of which Trollope knows nothing. We do not go to him for these high imaginative gifts. Nevertheless, he has much to give us. He calls the world back to sanity, to tolerance, and to righteousness of dealing and purpose. He tells us of the many things which belong unto our peace. His tears are cleansing, and his laughter is healing. He has a kindly humour rather than a scathing wit. Sometimes he pierces into the future, and reveals keen vision. For instance, he was one of the first of the English novelists to pay high tribute to the character and social service of people of the United States. How direct and honest he is! He says: 'A man who entertains in his mind any political doctrine, except as the means of improving the condition of his fellows, I regard as a political intriguer, a charlatan, and a conjuror.' He belongs neither to the right, nor to the left. He is no extremist. He believes that — that way madness lies. He is, however, a man of liberal mind who believes in progress, because he believes in man. In these tragic days — to quote his own words of one of his characters — 'he has helped to preserve us from the worst of all diseases — a low view of humanity'. He has taken us into a world of true values — where faith, and hope, and love, prevail.

W. BARDSLEY BRASH

---

## FRANCE AND OURSELVES

IT is commonly agreed, by those who have considered the questions and are seriously concerned with the problems of the future, that there can be no effective comity of nations and no enduring peace in Europe without the willing co-operation of a restored and respected France. As I view the matter, this essential end cannot be attained without real understanding and collaboration between Britain and France. Understanding depends on knowledge, knowledge of our several histories, of the strains, tendencies and traditions that, through the centuries, in common with ethnic and geographical factors, have welded us into nations.

In the case of France, we must think of a richly diversified country whose configuration, varied soils, and the effect of its geographical position, with its different climates — they say it has no less than nine — have made it one of the most richly endowed of all lands. Nor is its racial inheritance less diversified. To the fellowship of peoples that we call French, Celts, Romans, Franks of Teutonic stock, Greeks, Northmen, and Italians, to name no other, have contributed. It is important to remember that the characteristics of these stocks survive to-day. Contrast the unemotional, calculating Norman, the austere Breton schooled by the sea, the solid Burgundian, the tenacious man of the Central Plateau, the quick-tempered Gascon, with the loquacious and intense Provençal, or the peasant of Auvergne, with his limited vision and keen self-interest. Different as they are, they are all French. One wonders at their unity, until it is remembered that it springs from an attachment to their native soil which is no sentiment, but a passionate Faith.

Recent events may have tempered English criticism of the French. Few would now lay the responsibility for the armistice and collaboration with Germany at the door of the whole French nation; but doubt remains in many minds as to French reliability and the goodwill of the French people. Of this doubt, and of the misunderstanding which exists on both sides of the Channel, it is possible to distinguish various causes.

One of these, and not the least important, is, as has often been pointed out, the difference between the English and French mentalities. M. Maillaud<sup>1</sup> considers clear-sightedness, clarity and lucidity of vision to be the most permanent physical and moral attribute of his countrymen. Their main pre-occupation is 'to see things as they are'. The approach of the French to ethical problems and most human issues is naturally realistic. Disciplined imagination is regarded as indispensable to action. The qualities of true vision, realism, and precision in analysis and description are opposed to any confusion in thought and expression. The sense of proportion, measure, and sound diagnosis are characteristic of every form of French culture.

French criticism is based on unrelenting logic; and it is not surprising that British readiness to compromise, and reluctance to mortgage future liberty of action, have caused difficulties between us.

In a previous article in this *Review*<sup>2</sup> I called attention to the marked individualism of the French character. M. Maillaud points out that this is both an asset and a liability. He finds its roots in the family. While the importance of the family in French life cannot be over-rated, the individualism which is fostered by it produces a characteristic reaction to State problems arising from a limited outlook. It is not easy for the Frenchman to work with others, and this shows itself in international relations.

The Roman tradition, feebly felt in Britain, and Roman law, to this day deeply tinge the thought and affect the life of France. Wingfield-Stratford points out that, throughout her national development, France has lacked an element of continuity comparable with the English Common Law.

We can hardly say that, as a nation, we are consistently politically-minded: the French are. I remember how once, while in an air raid shelter in Paris during an alert, one man asked another, 'What shall we do when Peace is declared?' His friend replied, 'Oh, we shall go back to our politics, and the English to their football'. The French, says M. Maillaud, are particularly susceptible to collective atmosphere, and thus over-sensitive in political life. Their strong belief in national continuity makes them sometimes indifferent to political change.

Old antagonisms have not helped mutual understanding. Our two nations, throughout their history, have too often confronted one another as enemies, mainly because of dynastic ambitions. We do not always realize how little cause we have given the French to love us, for instance, in the Hundred Years War, although that long struggle, by strengthening and awakening national spirit, was a main factor in making the France of the present day. We may hope that the legend of 'perfidie Albion' is as dead as Nelson's word that it is the duty of the Englishman to hate the French as he does the Devil.

Religion too, has helped to widen the gulf between us. Since the break with

<sup>1</sup>Pierre Maillaud, *France*, p. 50 (Oxford University Press).

<sup>2</sup> October 1941, p. 379.

Rome, the Puritan tradition has been a great force in English life, and is still stronger than is often recognized. France has kept her Roman and 'Catholic' heritage.

In international relations the two peoples have been deeply influenced by their geographical position. England, divided from the Continent by the Channel, has been in Europe, but never wholly of it. She has faced the sea, and has pursued her destiny to the ends of the earth. France, despite her Atlantic coast, faces the Continent. She could never adopt a policy of 'splendid isolation'. With her open frontier on the north-east and the exposed position of Paris, the pressure from the east, of which Bainville speaks in his *Histoire de France*, has had momentous consequences for her. She has always lain open to attack by an aggressive power from the east.

Here Frenchmen see the historic mission of their country. As M. Maillaud puts it: 'For centuries, in peace and war, sometimes with ruthless tenacity (as in Richelieu's time), sometimes in desperate self-defence (as in the last war), France has stood a barrier to German aggression towards the west, as a western dyke to a flood which might at any moment submerge our civilization. . . . Whatever progress has been achieved in Europe within the framework of Western laws and culture is largely due to this guardianship, towards which England made, by different methods and even through quarrels and conflicts with France, an equally vast contribution.'<sup>1</sup>

It has been inevitable that France, in spite of her colonial expansion, should be a Continental rather than a world Power, though the French have taken much more interest in their Empire since 1914: and one consequence of this has been that the majority of Frenchmen have little appreciation of the immense contribution to our common victory made by British sea power.

I have previously drawn attention to a source of misunderstanding between the French and ourselves, or, let us say, a difficulty of mutual comprehension, arising from our differing systems of government. In the French system there has been from early times a tendency to centralization, gaining strength with the growing absolutism of the kings. Richelieu's conception of royalty involved it. At the Revolution, and under Napoleon, it became an accepted policy. To-day it is carried to extremes. As an instance of this, I may mention that when I urged upon the Inspector-General of Education in the French West African colonies the desirability and even the necessity of holding the qualifying examinations for African school teachers in the colony in which they lived, and not at the seat of the Governor-General in Dakar, he told me that, though he would strongly support the suggestion, the Governor-General himself had no power to act upon it, but that it would have to be referred to the Minister of Education in Paris. Naturally, no more was heard of it. The French 'Empire' is a *Colonial Empire*.

Extreme centralization not only means over-standardization; it means also delay, the accumulation of countless papers (*paperasses*) and the shirking of responsibility by subordinate officials, even in matters within their competence. It also means the multiplication of *fonctionnaires*.

My previous article in this *Review* drew attention to differences between French and English constitutional practice. In his admirable chapter on

<sup>1</sup> Pierre Maillaud, *France*, pp. 132-3.

'France Overseas', Dr. Fleure makes several points that are worthy of careful consideration. In her overseas territories, he points out that the policy of assimilating the government to that of metropolitan France has been opposed to our policy of fostering local autonomy.<sup>1</sup> Then, too, the French have been willing to extend to the peoples of these territories full French citizenship with no bar of colour, provided they approximated to European standards of education and conduct. This is, however, not to say that no discrimination remains.

While there is a general resemblance between the British and French Empires, Dr. Fleure points out a striking contrast between them, namely that, in contrast with our Dominions, there is no part of the French Empire which is settled by Frenchmen of France as the largest element in the population. This has greatly influenced the attitude of the French towards their overseas possessions.

He also cites a fundamental difference in the systems of the two nations, in that the French inter-marry with non-European women without incurring censure, and that non-Europeans may rise to high positions, even in France. The late M. Eboué, Governor of French Equatorial Africa, who led the way in rallying the French Colonies to General de Gaulle, is a striking instance of this significant fact.

The contrast between the position of non-Europeans in British and in French territories gives much food for thought, and for concern.

Dr. Fleure sums up his comparison of British and French overseas administration by recognizing that we have, on the whole, been fairly good trustees, though too slow to take the further step of collaboration, while the French, in spite of some errors, have had some success in seeking collaboration along with incorporation. As he rightly says, French and British have much to learn from one another.

Few Englishmen can understand the fragmentary party system in French politics. To the British observer the numerous parties, except perhaps the great ones, seem to stand for no recognizable principles, except that of self-interest. The necessity of bargaining with the various groups for support has caused the instability of French governments, which has been a standing danger and handicap in international relations and negotiations. The Frenchman may feel, as M. Maillaud says, that, while governments may come and go, France continues for ever; but Dr. Fleure's strictures, that there has not been enough collective responsibility for carrying on the national government, and not enough collective loyalty to the Republic, seems to be only too well founded.

Is it any wonder that, as M. Levy<sup>2</sup> says, many Frenchmen had, before 1939, conceived a profound distrust of politicians and all their ways! Certainly Pierre Laval is no recommendation for a system that made his career possible.

It is time to speak briefly of some of the problems that General de Gaulle's and any subsequent government will have to face.

The Republican laws and customs as they were in 1940 have been, as far as possible, restored. M. Edelman<sup>3</sup> points out, however, that, while the Constitu-

<sup>1</sup> Dr. H. J. Fleure, *French Life and its Problems*, p. 126 (Hachette).

<sup>2</sup> Louis Levy, *The Truth about France* (Penguin Special).

<sup>3</sup> Maurice Edelman, *France, The Birth of the Fourth Republic*, (Penguin Special 1944).

tion of 1875 remains valid, its instruments, the Chambers and the Presidential Office, are unoccupied. General de Gaulle's position as at once Chef d'Etat and Chef du Gouvernement, is not recognized by the 1875 Constitution. It would seem that a new Constituent Assembly must decide either to restore fully the Constitution, or to amend it. The regeneration of France must come from the will of the people democratically expressed. The Constitution, if it must be a paper scheme, must make adequate provision for modern needs in a developing European system. The executive must be able to take quicker and firmer action than it formerly could, and the manipulation of deputies with suggestions of prizes of office must be ended (Fieure). There will have to be real leadership and real national unity. Unless these things can be achieved, some of us think that there is only a limited hope for the future.

It is only necessary to mention the vast work of material reconstruction that must be carried out, the restoration of communications and means of transport, the rebuilding of villages, towns and cities, the redistribution of dislocated populations, the restoration of industry, the replacement of machinery, the supply of machine tools, the repair of ports, and the renewal of the mercantile marine.

Think of what M. Maillaud calls the 'demographic' problem, essentially that of a practically static birth-rate compared with Germany's increasing population. France suffered a colossal loss of man-power in the last war, from which she had not recovered in 1939. It has now been aggravated by her heavy casualties in this war and by the question as to how many of the two and a half million prisoners of war will return, and how many of them will be an asset and not a liability to the State.

Dare we hope that, in France, class warfare will cease? Elections are now promised before the end of this year.

What does the success of the Communists in the municipal elections portend? Will a truly national government be possible when the time comes to elect it? For an illuminating sketch of the rise of communistic ideas in France, the reader is referred to pages 90 ff. in M. Maillaud's book. Communists are included in the present Provisional Government, and they will have to be reckoned with in the future.

Both Dr. Fleure and M. Maillaud draw attention to the fundamental dualism in French economic life, a dualism that is much less apparent in England. With us 80 per cent of the population is urban, whereas in France over 50 per cent of the people live on the land. In the latter country the different social conceptions and claims of the rural and industrial populations create a very serious enduring tension, which has been a main cause of internal unrest between the two great wars. The heavy industries are chiefly located in the north-east; and it is there, and in such centres of industry as Lyons and Marseilles, that Communism flourishes.

Communism, which had been introduced into France during the last war, took a form which, in M. Maillaud's opinion, is utterly unadaptable to the French economy. He thinks that it is more intellectual than real among French political groups. It grew steadily in the '30s under foreign influence, assimilating the ideas of Italian corporativism and, to some extent, those of German National Socialism. It reached its full dimension in 1936. Its effect

has been to embitter class problems by the rise of parliamentary groups.

France has a most difficult economic problem to solve. Can she hold her own, in modern conditions, against powerfully industrialized countries, without widespread mechanization, which she has hitherto been reluctant to undertake?

She has been largely self-supporting, needing no very great volume of export trade, in striking contrast with the state of affairs in Britain. Can this state of things continue?

And what of the even greater problems of her moral rehabilitation? Here, I feel, we must make a very sincere effort to understand her position and her feelings. In this war we have suffered far less than she. Years of ruthless occupation, domination, and pillage by a loathed foreign power, her physical and mental anguish, have wounded the French spirit very deeply, and left an indelible impression on the French mind. Her land lay prostrate under the heel of the conqueror, but her spirit, as she has shown gloriously, was, and is, unconquered.

She must be given time to adjust herself to her newly-won liberty. She may embark upon policies and pursue courses of action which may seem to us unacceptable. She may have to win her way to a settled equilibrium by a process of trial and error. Let us, at least, seek to understand, not only what she does, but why she does it. She will need all the material and moral help that we can give her; but she will accept that help willingly only as we give it as her understanding sympathetic and, above all, tactful friend. General de Gaulle has said, and here, I am sure, he voices the feeling of his countrymen: 'France declines to take lessons from abroad.' It is not lessons that she needs, but help.

The greatest of France's external problems is, of course, that of security. Whatever adjustments may eventually be made as regards her north-eastern frontier, she must never again be subjected to German aggression. She has reverted to her former policy by concluding a treaty with Russia. For unexplained reasons, negotiations for a similar pact with Britain are suspended. Let us hope that this will not be long delayed. Unless adequate safeguards are devised, and used, the high birth-rate of Germany and the low birth-rate of France will revive the ancient pressure from the east. As long as the iron of Lorraine and the coal of the Ruhr are under the control of different and unfriendly governments, friction is sure to arise.

Unless such pacts as we have mentioned are brought within a wider organization, we shall be setting up again a balance of power such as has been discredited as a means of preventing war. On the subject of security, M. Maillaud makes observations that demand to be carefully examined. He says: 'Security must however remain a hypothetical notion so long as we are not satisfied that Europe has completed her social and international evolution, for deliberate will-to-war by a nation or several nations is not the sole cause of conflict. And it would be madness to suppose that after the war Europe will reach her final state through a mere process of political planning, however far-sighted the settlement may be.'<sup>1</sup>

Surely he is right. To achieve security, we need something more vital and dynamic than any political and international organization. We need friend-

<sup>1</sup> Pierre Maillaud, *France*, p. 131.

ship; and a long step will have been taken towards the goal if we can establish real friendship and co-operation between Britain and France.

Is this too much to hope for? We have made some progress. We have, at least, ceased to caricature and ridicule one another. That is something, but it is not enough.

Are our two nations so wide apart, after all? All through the centuries, since almost prehistoric contacts between Cornwall and Brittany, our fortunes have been linked together. We have fought with one another, but we have co-operated in peace, and in war we have marched and suffered together. The plaque in the south aisle of *Nôtre-Dame*, commemorating the hosts of Britons slain in the last great war who sleep in French soil, is a symbol of something that lies very deep.

We look at things from different points of view, we may react to the same stimuli in different ways, but I believe that our national characteristics are not antagonistic, but complementary. Both nations are fundamentally idealists. We, like the French, believe in 'Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity', though we do not speak about them as freely as the French do, and though we, like them, have too often only rendered them lip-service.

Throughout history, and in spite of frequent wars, influences from each of our two countries have reached and enriched the other. Our debt to France in the realms of Literature, Criticism, Religion, Art — especially Painting and Architecture — in Science and Medicine, is incalculable. In many ways France has learned from us.

At the end of the fourteenth century, Hoccleve, an inferior poet, but a true patriot, wrote these lines of England and France:

If but of you might be read or sung  
 That you were one in heart, there is no tongue  
 That might express how profitable and good  
 Unto all people it were of Christian blood.<sup>1</sup>

HERBERT L. BISHOP

### THE RIDER OF THE LONG TRAIL\*

**S**AINTS are a disturbing factor in society. They were accused by their New Testament antagonists of turning the world upside down. In George Bernard Shaw's drama, Joan was not welcome when she returned from the dead to greet the egregious weakling she had enthroned in France, and her reception was typical of that given to many other worthies of the calendar in this world and the next.

I have recently noted some severe criticism of the Methodism in your nation. The major part of it is negligible, and most of it is deeply tinged with prejudice or ignorance. Grant me a few moments to trace its origin and its works, and judge for yourselves as to its influence upon this Republic and the world at

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Wingfield Stratford, in his *History of British Civilization*, p. 280 (Routledge).

<sup>2</sup> We are privileged to be able to publish, through the good offices of Mr. George Prowcott, this manuscript written by the late S. Parkes Cadman in 1924. It is a fitting tribute by a great Anglo-American to Francis Asbury, whose bicentenary is being celebrated on August 20 of this year [EDITOR].

large. It began with John Wesley, whose combination of indefatigable industry, cool judgement, command over others, faculty for organization, patience, and moderation marked him as a ruler of men. Had he taken to military affairs, he would have equalled his relative, the Duke of Wellington. Had he entered politics, he would have rivalled Pitt; but his native gifts, learning, and clear logical style in speech and writing were dedicated to religion. His asceticism was Franciscan; his zeal resembled that of St. Paul. Beginning as an intolerant churchman he ended as a universal lover and servant of mankind. Under him the Evangelical Revival made the scepticism and immorality of the eighteenth century beat a retreat. The spread of his doctrines profoundly swayed the ethics and the faith of the nineteenth century. There is no more highly disciplined or compact body of believers in the Christendom of the twentieth century than those connected with the Methodist Churches. Wesley was represented in America by proxy rather than by person, apart from one brief stay in Georgia, the latest of our thirteen colonies, he knew the New World only at a distance. His followers appeared here, not by preconcerted arrangement, but in a spontaneous fashion. They owed little enough to the institutional Christianity of their time, and still less to the cultured wealthier classes. In 1760 a band of Irish Methodists landed in New York, chiefly German by descent and linen weavers by occupation, they became the unaccredited ambassadors of the new movement which did much to restore its God-consciousness to England. The names of Barbara Heck, Philip Embury and Captain Thomas Webb in our city and of Robert Shawbridge in the Colony of Maryland are revered throughout Methodism. Comment on their undertakings is best expressed in the following statistics. From the joint labours of an obscure woman, two carpenters, and an officer of the British Army have sprung churches with nearly ten million members, fifty thousand ministers, and sixty-four thousand sanctuaries. Their first shrines were a sail loft and a log cabin. Their modern buildings rank with those of the older denominations in architectural merit and size. But the man whose extraordinary personality made him the American proxy and veritable other self of Wesley did not land here till 1771. In every respect Francis Asbury is the outstanding figure of this marvellous spiritual renaissance in our country. Neither the eloquent Whitefield nor the scholarly and urbane Coke so absolutely identified himself with Wesley's spirit and purposes as did Asbury. His long tenure of the episcopal office was beset with chronic ill health, and constant hardships, interspersed with not a few perils and manifold hazards. He traversed destitute regions and lived in them as the pioneer of pioneers, resolute and invincible, till death released him. In speech plain, in manner reserved, with the blended boldness and caution of his blood, he gave an unwavering allegiance to sacred enterprises more dear to him than life itself. St. Joan would have placed him at her right hand in battle. If Catherine of Siena would have enlisted him for the restitution of the Church, St. Ignatius would have given him a foremost position in his Order. St. Francis would have exulted in the kindred spirit of this second St. Francis. It was fortunate that he bore his name since he inherited his passion for the Unseen and the Eternal. Goodness such as that of 'The Rider of the Long Trail' is infinitely more interesting than evil, has more fascinating varieties and produces more enduring charms.

If the author of the Hebrew Epistle felt none would fail to enumerate the celebrities of Israel's story, how much more will time fail us to afford more than a glance at the bright shadows of God's glorious servants lingering in the memory of the Christian Church. All kinds of temperament are here: all types and measures of intellect, all vocations of life. In richest profusion the saints shine forth upon their succeeding ages, and by no means least among them was this magistrate of American civilization whose largest obstacles were equally his opportunities. Before he died Asbury enjoined that no biography of him should be published; but he could not escape it. At least seven have been issued, and the one by the Reverend President Tipple, of Drew Seminary, is a clear and sympathetic work well worth your careful reading. The Bishop was born on August 20, 1745, at or near Handsworth, a suburb of Birmingham, the well-known manufacturing centre of mid England: the city of Joseph Priestley, who afterwards lived and died in the United States; of Joseph Chamberlain and by parliamentary representation of John Bright. Asbury began his matchless ministry here in 1771, when he was but twenty-six years of age. Its long tenure reminds one of Bunyan's words in *Pilgrim's Progress*: 'Some also have wished that their Father's House were here, that they might be troubled no more with either hills or mountains to go over. *But the Way is the Way and there is an End.*' The Way proved arduous beyond description for this warrior of the Cross, and the End lay far from his native shire and from the loved ones whom he saw no more. He traversed many wild territories and morally destitute regions, bore much bodily pain and kept his vows inviolate till death released him on March 31, 1816. Asbury's success as a religious propagandist owed little to outward circumstances and much to his intrinsic merits as a man. Married only to the Church, he sacrificed domestic joys on her behalf and was absorbed in her affairs. Alive to the spiritual needs of a newly born nation suddenly invested with self-government and limitless prospects, he rose superior to the unexpected situation. When the Virginian clergy and some British-born ministers of the Gospel fled homeward before the impending storms of revolution and war, he dug in as Wellington did at Torres Vedras, and steadied the thin wavering lines of his itinerants until peace was made and their next advance could be ordered. I know no other modern Church leader who has quite equalled Asbury's achievement in creating for a nation in arms against his native land a religious revolution out of the chaos of a political revolution. In grateful recognition of this and other results of his Evangelizing crusade, on October 15, 1924, President Coolidge unveiled his statue at our national capital. It stands in a place of public concourse with the bronze figure of the Bishop on horseback as the lone rider of the long trail. Its replica was unveiled upon the campus of Drew Seminary, Madison, New Jersey, in October this year. It commemorates a preacher, a leader, an ecclesiastical statesman, and a bishop who travelled 270,000 miles in his adopted land, preached 16,500 sermons, ordained 4,000 ministers of the Gospel, and presided over 224 Conferences. Macaulay and John Richard Green have praised Wesley's organization of Methodism. That of Asbury was quite upon a parity with the Founder's. Nearly every existing institution bears the marks of his loyal co-operation with his spiritual Father.

His circuit riders deserve a radio evening broadcast over this country to exhibit their exploitation of the Christian Evangel. Buffoons may jest about their grave faces, plain attire, rigid beliefs, abstention from pleasure, long prayers and longer sermons, lit up with lurid descriptions of a veritable hell of endless torments. But buffoons build nothing, pull down not a little, and at best play the clown for sated lovers of amusement. Church and State and whatever in them is valuable have been originated, maintained and enlarged by serious-minded men who were the normal outgrowth of the prevalent religious sentiment. Moreover, these itinerants ran true to form. Their predecessors can be discerned in the Friars of the thirteenth century and the Friends of the eighteenth. Scope of Norwich went through that ancient English city in 1425 in sackcloth, calling it to repentance, George Fox walked along the streets of Lichfield, the ancient cathedral city of Asbury's native province, barefooted and denunciatory. We reserve our extraordinary persons and processions for the circus; the saints used them for the Lord. Hard-bitten veterans to a man, the American itinerants crossed the Alleghanies, forded the Ohio, Mississippi, and Missouri rivers, pushed into the Rockies, camped on the Pacific slope. Asbury led them until physical weakness forbade, and to the last he planned the campaigns they cheerfully undertook. It was nothing for them to receive an appointment from their Bishop a thousand miles away from the frontiers of human habitation. Canada was swept into their jurisdiction. In far-off Oregon their praises resounded among the primeval pine forests. Although not scholars they had the sound sense which men esteem, and thoroughly understood the diversified social groups to which they ministered. They were shrewd, diligent, indomitable, resistless in their search for souls. Individualized as even few Americans have been, these early Methodist preachers sometimes developed an eccentric like Lorenzo Dow or Peter Cartwright; characters whose vagaries alarmed the staid brethren but delighted the untutored audiences of the forests and prairies. They were ill to meddle with, as numerous outlaws and ruffians found to their cost. As for dull care and soul-sickening melancholy, these men never knew them. They were as far removed from the bilious hypocrites and kill-joys depicted in our Press as the artists who thus depict them are from truth and candour. Their trials and emergencies were transformed by a vibrant faith. They jested at ordeals before which their critics would have turned tail. They wove the merriest tales of their ministry out of its sorriest prospects. Many died before they reached maturity. But they had lived so gloriously that death had no terrors for them. They have vanished now; their rough forms and bearded faces and travel-stained apparel are no longer seen in our centres of population. The virgin territories they covered are now studded with roaring cities and threaded by railroads and highways along which flash luxurious trains and speedy cars. The camp meeting in the woods and groves, the log huts at the crossroads, the meeting houses hastily put together in rude but reverent fashion have also disappeared. But their spirit lives in their successors. The recollection of Asbury's heroism and endurance and of the disciplined attack of his preachers upon the immorality and godlessness of their period is now a perennial source of ministerial devotion and efficiency. It is easy for those who, without the vast benefits of a civic freedom they helped to create and to spiritualize, to mock their useful toil. It is

customary to attribute to politicians the achievements which properly belong to these shock troops of the Christian Church. It is sometimes profitable from the financial standpoint to ridicule their fanaticism and extravagance. The one answer to these jibes and misrepresentations is the fruit of the itinerant's labour. He not only evangelized, he aided in founding cities and states. He rode ahead of the gambler, the roué, the outlaw, the desperado, the land grabber, the slave owner, and practised the maxim: 'first come, first served.' Self-seeking and personal aggrandisement may have infected some sections of Methodist officialdom; but they did not taint his spirit. He was the finest evangelizing force of his day, and reproduced in it the consecration of the medieval worthies who held a proud blood-stained and reckless society in awe.

One is frequently asked which Church, if any, of our competing forms of the Faith will survive, and triumph. *In the long last it will be that church which has the noblest ideals of its mission and is prepared to make the greatest sacrifices in their behalf.* Splendid edifices, educational establishments, intellectual sermons, and rich rituals of themselves will not avail. The religious zeal according to knowledge which saves great nations and small from moral discord and spiritual destitution and helps to build their civilization of goodness, truth, and beauty will ultimately obtain here and everywhere. In the retrospect Methodism's pioneering march into the heart of this nation crippled the pioneers. As armies in battle cannot always select their positions, nor be too fastidious about their physical requirements, so Asbury and his valiant soldiers made our progress possible at a heavy tax on keen flesh and blood. In other words, like St. Paul, St. Peter, and St. Francis, they were God's foals; but the vine they planted and watered with the life-juice of their veins, has run over the wall and spread in every direction. Institutional Methodism is a mighty factor in our national life, as the foes of righteousness and decency have every reason to recall. Yet it is the least result of the still mightier Methodist movement out of which it arose. Our social and political reforms at home and the expansion of Christianity beyond seas can be traced to the Evangelical Revival of the eighteenth century. Its noblest outcome is vividly described in the pages of Green's *Short History*. It was not till the Wesleyan crusade had done its work that Protestantism, like a giant aroused from sleep, arose and began its philanthropic movement. Then came Sunday Schools, Bible Societies, Missionary extensions, and that passionate impulse of human sympathy with the wronged and afflicted which raised hospitals, endowed colleges and charities, built churches, sent God's messengers to the heathen, supported Burke in his plea for the Hindu, and Clarkson, Wilberforce, and later still, Lincoln, in their onslaught against the slave traffic. In all these enterprises Asbury's name is registered high. He stands forth on the golden roll of those of every creed and sect who have wrought righteousness, tamed wickedness, and contributed to the religious and ethical assets which are our real wealth.

It seems anomalous that a British-born man would be one of the large religious assets of the Republic; that a follower of Wesley, whose word for him was law, should have a hold through his spiritual children upon the life of this nation which is the more real because indirect. When the Declaration of

Independence was signed no Methodist names were attached to it and the Constitution had none among its framers. Yet to-day Methodists outnumber every other Church in our Congress. They represent, in the main, the abysmal difference between the ideals of Evangelical Puritanism and those of more recent immigrations here. Until now, the descendants of the earlier settlers have retained control of this nation; but the issues between them and their rivals are definitely drawn and have begun to colour political life. Shall our democracy be purely political or swayed by religious ideals? This is the question of questions. Lincoln's tribute to Methodism seems to favour the religious basis of the State. In reply to a delegation from the General Conference of Northern Methodism in 1864 he said:

Nobly sustained as the Government has been by all the Churches, I would utter nothing which might in the least appear invidious against any. Yet without this it may fairly be said that the Methodist Episcopal Church, not less devoted than the best, is, by its greater numbers, the most important of all. It is no fault in others that the Methodist Church sends more soldiers to the field, more nurses to the hospitals, and more prayers to heaven than any. God bless the Methodist Church! bless all the Churches! and blessed be God, who in this our great trial giveth us the Churches!<sup>1</sup>

There is no embittered comment on political parsons and sectarian bigotries when the State is in danger. Then we can go as far as we please, provided we unfailingly cry that our god is war. But what about the war on political chicanery, diplomatic lies and evasions, drunkenness, gambling, social vice, and a swarm of kindred evils? Are ministers of God to be dumb dogs in the presence of these iniquities? I think not.

So long as Asbury's temper animates Methodist preachers they will not sell the pass, nor suffer this nation to be defrauded of its moral rights by sophisticated rhetoricians who pander to the lower motives of conduct.

All honour, then, to Francis Asbury, a maker and builder of the United States of America, and still more of the Church which is in the midst of her.

S. PARKES CADMAN

### IN THE WILDERNESS

#### A Study in the Temptations of Jesus

THE wilderness came very close to the inhabitants of Palestine. What is more, many of them had it in their blood. Israel came from the desert, and in spite of the great cultural development involved in their settlement in Palestine, there was always a strain of the primitive at work in their national life.

This is a factor which has to be taken into account in any attempt to understand the religion of Israel, even in its later stages. In the beginning the thing is obvious. Whatever may have been the value of Patriarchal religion, it was Moses who first made Israel one people, and laid the strong foundations of

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Abel Stevens in his *American Methodism* (1885), p. 475.

Israel's faith: and Moses, to carry out his work, led the people out of Egypt — turning his face away from one of the greatest civilizations of the Ancient World — and took them into the wilderness, to the Mount of God. There in the desert Jehovah was made manifest to them, and thereafter it was to Horeb and to the desert that Israel looked back as the source and continuing inspiration of their faith.

Elijah, despairing of the outcome of his struggle against Jezebel and the priests of Baal, went forty days' journey into the wilderness until he came to the Mount of God and found Jehovah there. The Rechabites swore to have no dwelling save in tents, and to drink no drop of the wine of Canaan, harking back in their turn to the simpler and more austere life of Jehovah's first worshippers in the desert. These are striking instances of a lasting tendency among the more sincerely religious of the children of Israel; to turn away from the snares and corruptions of civilization, and to seek God where He was first revealed and worshipped.

That this tendency was still very much alive in the time of Jesus is made clear by the man whom the Church has always regarded as His herald, John the Baptist. 'The voice of one crying in the wilderness' — even Mark's brief account shows that the last three words are not here by accident. 'John came, who baptized in the wilderness and preached the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins . . . and John was clothed with camel's hair, and had a leathern girdle about his loins, and did eat locusts and wild honey.'<sup>1</sup> He came in the desert, dressed in desert clothes and eating desert food: and to hear his message and undergo his baptism the people of Jerusalem and Judea had to come out into the desert, leaving their cities and houses and farms behind.

John is unmistakably in the tradition of those who would call in the fire of desert asceticism to purify the corruptions of Canaan. His word is the old prophetic word: for an interpretation of the Greek *μετανοεῖτε* ('repent'), with its connotations so alien to Hebrew thought, we must look to the Hebrew *בָּאֵת* ('return'), proclaimed with all the feeling which the prophets had bestowed upon it.

Now it is to John that Jesus comes at the fords of Jordan, and with this baptism that He is baptized. Mark treats the things which befell at the baptism as private to the experience of Jesus, and the Fourth Gospel adds only that they were apparent to the Baptist also. It is the other two Synoptic Gospels (whether from the source Q or not is not clear) which treat the occurrences as if they were seen and heard by the multitude. It is disputable also whether or not it was here that Jesus first became fully possessed of His Messianic consciousness; but these points are not material. In this baptism, whether privately or amid the wonder of the multitude, the Spirit comes upon Him — the Breath of God which men had first felt blowing in the great winds of the desert, even if here it comes with a difference. Jesus leaves the place prepared at last to enter upon His ministry.

Perhaps even then we should not be justified in laying any stress upon the relationship of Jesus with John the Baptist, nor in suggesting a consequent significance for the wilderness-motif in our Lord's thought, if He had begun

<sup>1</sup> Mark i. 3-6.

His ministry straight away. But, in fact, one further preliminary intervened, apparently as a direct result of the baptismal experience. 'Straightway the Spirit driveth Him forth into the wilderness,' says Mark, 'and He was in the wilderness forty days tempted of Satan; and He was with the wild beasts; and the angels ministered unto Him.'<sup>1</sup>

Concerning the nature of the temptation Mark is curiously silent, but the omission is supplied by Q. The accounts in Matthew and Luke differ in certain respects, notably in the order of events. One or other of the Evangelists may have known another tradition than Q. But substantially they tell the same tale, with no divergences which need cause any important difficulty. Jesus is led by the Spirit into the desert, where the Devil confronts Him with three separate challenges. Jesus replies to each with a sentence of scripture, and the Devil retires defeated (though Luke adds the ominous words 'for a season').

Now unless this story is a piece of pure invention, it is clear that it must have come from the lips of Jesus Himself. There is no disciple with Him here, as there was, for instance, at the Transfiguration, to give the report even of a bewildered mind. No one could have told what befell Jesus unless Jesus Himself told it first. For this reason the authenticity of the story has until recently been taken for granted. Doubts, however, are now raised. Their nature may be stated in the words of the late Professor J. M. Creed: 'That a period of retirement and spiritual struggle should have succeeded the experiences of the baptism is not in itself unintelligible. It is a further question whether our accounts of the temptation in the desert depend on the testimony of the only person who could have given first-hand testimony.... Our answer will partly depend on our view of the probability of such autobiographical communications on the part of Jesus, partly also on the character of the narratives themselves.'<sup>2</sup>

Creed has enlarged on the first of these two considerations in his discussion of the baptismal story, quoting Origen's judgement that such self-revelations are not in harmony with the character of Him who said: 'If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true.'<sup>3</sup> No doubt this argument would have weight if we were asked to suppose that Jesus recounted His experiences at baptism or those in the wilderness as formal testimony to His own authority, which is the kind of 'witness' to which the Johannine saying refers; but surely we are no more required to believe this than we are to believe that Jesus told these things merely to satisfy the idle curiosity of inquirers who wanted to know how He came to put His hand to such work. Jesus was not merely doing a great work; He was also training others to assist and to succeed Him in it; and Jesus was not the first teacher, as He has not been the last, to draw on His own innermost experience in order to enable His followers to understand His method.

The second consideration is set out by Creed as follows: 'It seems likely that the picture as given in Q has been filled in by the imagination of the early Church. The balanced structure of the three temptations with the three quotations of Scripture in reply suggests a reflective dramatization of the

<sup>1</sup> Mark i. 12-13.   <sup>2</sup> *Gospel According to St. Luke*, p. 61.   <sup>3</sup> John v. 31; cf. Creed, op. cit., p. 56.

rejection by Jesus of false Messianic ideals.' He refers to 'magical feats ascribed to Simon Magus and others parallel to the first and third temptations' (Lucan order), and continues: 'The Gospel narrative is not improbably designed to distinguish the claims and character of Jesus Christ from those of false Christs and false prophets. Perhaps the narrative reflects a reaction against crude belief in miracles within the Church.'<sup>1</sup>

So far as this last sentence is concerned, one can only say that the evidence for any such reaction (one in itself highly desirable) is extremely scanty if not non-existent. Let us take up the main line of argument. It is true enough that human temptations and perplexities do not as a rule present themselves in quite such a tidy and manageable form as we find here, and we may be fairly sure that they did not come to Jesus in this form either. During the days which He spent in the wilderness the tremendous problem of what He was to do, as Son of God in a needy and sinful world, must have occupied His mind continuously, presenting itself first in one form and then in another. To realize that what He had to do was nothing less than to decide exactly what was the purpose of God for human life, and how it was to be worked out in the difficult circumstances of His time, is to marvel that He ever reached any certainty at all. That He did so is attested by the ministry which followed: but what lesser mind could have conceived the turmoil of that mental conflict, let alone have reduced it to the three little sketches in which the issues are summed up for us? Beyond doubt the temptation-stories are a 'reflective dramatization'. But who was more likely to have made it, or more capable of making it so brilliantly, than the author of the parables?

The attack on the authenticity of the temptation-stories is quite inconclusive. Can we go farther than this? Is it possible to show that the elements of the narrative are such as would readily have presented themselves to the mind of Jesus in the situation in which He found Himself? The thesis which will be put forward here is that the very setting of the story provides a clue to the nature of the problems which presented themselves to Jesus, and that all the details of the three separate encounters with the Devil appear in their true proportion and significance within the framework of thought thus attained. Here as in so many other respects the key to the understanding of our Lord's mind is to be found in the Old Testament, in the long history of God's dealings with His chosen people: and the key in this instance is indicated by the fact that the temptation of Jesus took place *in the wilderness*.

We may begin by noting the confusion of sources at the opening of the narrative. Mark says that Jesus 'was in the wilderness forty days tempted' (present participle passive) 'of Satan; and He was with the wild beasts; and the angels ministered' (imperfect) 'unto Him'.<sup>2</sup> This suggests, if full value is given to the tenses, that the temptation and the angelic ministry went on throughout the forty days. Matthew's version is quite different: 'Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the Devil, and when He had fasted forty days and forty nights, He afterward hungered. And the Tempter came and said unto Him . . .'.<sup>3</sup> This makes the forty days of fasting precede the temptation, while the angelic ministry is postponed until

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., p. 62.

<sup>2</sup> Mark i. 13.

<sup>3</sup> Matthew iv. 1, 2.

## IN THE WILDERNESS

after the temptation is over. Luke says that Jesus 'was led by the Spirit in the wilderness during forty days, being tempted' (present participle passive) 'of the Devil. And He did eat nothing in those days: and when they were completed, He hungered. And the Devil said unto Him . . .'<sup>1</sup> This seems to be a rather illogical confusion of the two previous versions, the first sentence following Mark, the rest agreeing with and even emphasizing Matthew's account. The simplest explanation of these facts is to suppose that we have a Marcan version on the one hand and a Q version on the other (represented most closely by Matthew), while Luke makes a not very successful attempt to combine the two.

It may have been this confusion of the sources which has obscured the significance of the Q story, together perhaps with the tendency to accept Mark's account of the life of Jesus as primary in every respect. I have not space to argue, and will merely state my opinion that at this point the Marcan tradition is secondary. If Mark's curt reference to the temptation is put aside, and its influence on the Lucan version discounted, we may reasonably suppose that Q told how Jesus was led into the desert forty days and forty nights, fasting, before the temptation began.

As soon as we consider this unequivocal statement, two parallels leap to the mind, as the compilers of the marginal references to the Authorized Version realized. We have already quoted the story of Elijah's flight from Jezebel. The exactness of the parallel can be seen from 1 Kings xix. 8, where Elijah, after being provided with angelic food, 'arose, and did eat and drink, and went in the strength of that meat forty days and forty nights unto Horeb, the Mount of God'. The other parallel is twice repeated, in Deuteronomy ix. 8 and 18. Here Moses speaks of his sojourn in Horeb: 'when I was gone up into the mount to receive the tables of stone, even the tables of the Covenant which the Lord made with you, then I abode in the mount forty days and forty nights, I neither did eat bread nor drink water.' (The sojourn is repeated because of the breaking of the first tables of the Law after the people's sin with the Golden Calf.)

Are we to suppose that the Q version of the temptation of Jesus contains a deliberate allusion to one or both of these Old Testament stories? If so, we may begin to wonder whether there is any significance, not only in those elements in them which are mentioned in the Gospels, but also in the one reference common to them both which is not there explicit — the reference to Horeb. Is the temptation-story to be read against the background of a journey through the desert to the Mount of God? Are we to understand that as Elijah in a time of spiritual crisis turned to Horeb, the holy place where Moses, after leading his people out of Egypt, had received the revelation upon which their subsequent destiny rested, so Jesus at another and greater climacteric of history sought the same ancient retreat? It is not necessary to insist upon a bodily journey to the actual mountain. It will suffice if we can be satisfied that this was the setting in which the thought of Jesus was framed. If there is any evidence to support this theory, what light does it throw upon the temptations themselves? To find an answer to such questions as these we must consider the temptations in some detail.

<sup>1</sup> Luke iv. 1-3.

Both Matthew and Luke proceed to the first of the Devil's challenges from the statement that, after His fast, Jesus was hungry. This apparently natural remark may be in fact a piece of dramatic mechanism. The story approaches possibility in Matthew, where the fasting may imply no more than the meagre fare imposed on Jesus by desert conditions; but in Luke the whole situation demands a supernatural endurance. As Bernhard Weiss pointed out,<sup>1</sup> if Jesus took no food for forty days (even allowing that this may be a round number), then He must have been miraculously sustained for this period, as Elijah was. The hunger is then no more than a device to introduce the temptation.

Whether or not this is true, it is clear that it was not merely the physical hunger of Jesus which provoked the temptation. Even if it was His own hunger which first made Jesus ask Himself whether a hungry Messiah was not a contradiction in terms, assuredly His mind did not stop there. The situation has a parallel, which could not have failed to come to the mind of any Israelite, in the historical background upon which we have been insisting. In the days when the chosen people of God were travelling through the wilderness to Horeb, they were hungry, and God fed them with bread from heaven.

There is no objection to this analogy in the fact that in the one case a people and in the other an individual are concerned. Jesus is a chosen individual as Israel was a chosen people, and it is this relationship with God which is the root factor. More, the analogy was not new: in more than one of the later passages of the Old Testament it is impossible to be sure whether we are reading of a typical individual or of the nation personified. As soon as any man feels himself to be the Chosen of God he stands in the same position as Israel did. Finally, Jesus is not merely a private individual, but one who is to save His people: what applies to Him first will apply to them afterwards, so that His case is in some sense a test for theirs.

Here then is the setting of the temptation: 'If thou art the Son of God, command that these stones become bread.'<sup>2</sup> (Luke has the singular, 'this stone', but the change seems to have no special significance.) In the first great deliverance of Israel, Moses had been able to draw upon miraculous reserves of food, and by that Divine aid his authority and the people's faith had been sustained. If Jesus was indeed the new deliverer for whom Israel waited, surely He could command the same resources.

It is very difficult to understand, at first sight, why this challenge should be judged to be of the Devil. To Jesus, with His unfailing sympathy with human distress, even more than to Moses, Israel's need would come as a quite legitimate appeal. Why should He not give His people bread? We need not waste time in trying to invent reasons, for all the Gospels tell us that He did on occasion do this very thing. The same stories dispose also of another suggestion that has been made, that it was the miracle involved which was objectionable; in the Feeding of the Five Thousand we have just such a miracle. Why then will Jesus not work it here? The answer must lie in the one remaining element of the Devil's challenge. Jesus will not turn stones to bread in order to prove that He is the Son of God.

The assumption underlying the demand is that God must desire His people to be fed, and that His true representative must make this a part of His work:

<sup>1</sup> Meyer's *Kommentar zum N.T.*, I. ii, p. 335, note.

<sup>2</sup> Matthew iv, 3.

only a repetition of the physical deliverance wrought by Moses will be accepted as a valid sign of Divine calling. Jesus will not allow God's purpose or method to be limited by any such assumption, any more than John the Baptist would allow a limitation by the accident of physical parentage.<sup>1</sup> His rejection of the challenge might have been put in many ways. He might have pointed out the oddness of the fact that God, having once delivered His people by the hand of Moses, had ever allowed them to fall once more into need. He chose instead to follow up the allusion to history, and to show that even in the deliverance which Moses wrought, the satisfaction of physical need was not an end in itself.

The fact that Jesus answers the Devil by quoting the Moses-story in Deuteronomy viii is another piece of evidence that we are working along the right line. The passage is worth quoting at length: 'Thou shalt remember all the way which the Lord thy God led thee these forty years in the wilderness, to humble thee and to prove thee, to know what was in thy heart, whether thou wouldest keep His commandments or no. And He humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna, which thou knewest not, neither did thy fathers know; that He might make thee know that man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord.'<sup>2</sup>

Here the purpose of the miraculous feeding was not the satisfaction of physical need, but the teaching of a spiritual lesson: and this lesson, it is illuminating to find, was taught not only by feeding the people, but also by letting them hunger. Jesus goes to the heart of the earlier miracle. 'Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.'<sup>3</sup> This is no denial of man's need of material food, nor a refusal to contemplate the supplying of that need, by miraculous or any other means. It is simply an insistence upon a proper sense of values. The first purpose of God, and therefore of God's Son, was to give men the Bread of Life. The giving of earthly bread might serve to help or to hinder, in this greater task, but in no sense could it serve to test it. For this reason, bread must not be a primary demand upon the Son of God.<sup>4</sup>

At this point there is a divergence between Matthew and Luke, who give the second and third temptations in a different order. Matthew takes Jesus straightway to the pinnacle of the Temple, Luke to the point of vantage from which He can see all the kingdoms of the world. There is also a divergence among the commentators, who are not agreed as to which order is original.

Is there anything in our present approach to the story which may provide a solution of the difficulty? We are suggesting that Jesus' mind had gone back to the story of Israel's first deliverance under Moses. It would not be unnatural for the order of events in that story to suggest the order of His thought; and that order, as recorded in the Book of Exodus, does indeed find a clear correspondence in the Matthaeian order of the temptations. This is what we should expect, since Matthew is in every way more interested in the Old Testament than Luke, and is far more likely to have been conscious of the Old Testament background of the story as it stood in his source. That Matthew's order is

<sup>1</sup> Matthew iii. 9.

<sup>4</sup> See the excellent commentary in John vi.

<sup>2</sup> Deuteronomy viii. 2-3.

<sup>3</sup> Matthew iv. 4.

original will appear if we proceed with the examination of the temptations in his order.

In the second temptation 'the Devil taketh Him up into the Holy City; and he set Him on a pinnacle of the Temple, and said unto Him, If thou art the Son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written, He shall give His angels charge concerning thee: and on their hands they shall bear thee up, lest haply thou dash thy foot against a stone'.<sup>1</sup>

This temptation is generally interpreted as a proposal that Jesus shall perform a spectacular miracle, and by so doing compel popular wonder, admiration, awe, and support. The similar miracle ascribed to Simon Magus is adduced in support of this view. Creed says: 'The temptation and its rejection should be set against the background of stories of flights through the air ascribed to wonder-workers.'<sup>2</sup>

These stories, however, seem to be of much later date than the Gospels, and it is on the whole more reasonable to understand them as popular interpretations and adaptations of the Gospel narrative than to suppose a contrary influence. Moreover, it must be pointed out that the interpretation thus suggested brings more to the story than it finds there. There is no hint in the Gospels that any of the populace were present at all to the mind of Jesus, nor that the object of the Devil's proposed experiment was to impress anyone beside Himself. The simplest interpretation of the story as it stands is that Jesus shall test the reality of His Divine sonship by challenging the power of God to save Him from death: that He shall deliberately thrust Himself into peril, and claim the fulfilment of the promise made in the 91st Psalm to the truly righteous man, 'that dwelleth in the secret place of the Most High'.

In the first temptation, hunger is said to have introduced the subject of the Devil's proposal. We may well ask what produced the second? What led Jesus, after the exalted mood of the Baptism, even to think of danger and death? Perhaps at the most superficial level, a natural reaction of mind from the exaltation. The fear of falling from a high place is a very familiar dream-symbol to the psychologist, occurring in the minds of those who have reached (or who expect to reach) what they feel to be high position in any sphere of life. The position here, high on a wing of the Temple, obviously symbolizes exaltation in the religious sphere. A brave man might well admit the fear, and desire to challenge it in action.

As in the first temptation, however, the merely personal reaction is far from exhausting the possibilities. For the faithful Israelite there was again an obvious parallel. The fact that even the righteous might fall into need had persistently exercised the minds of God's chosen people over several centuries; but it reached its point of greatest difficulty whenever need grew into disaster. Again and again those who passionately believed in Jehovah had affirmed His power to keep His faithful people in safety. The stories of the Book of Daniel were told amid the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes, and the Devil has no difficulty in finding a Psalm to fit his purpose. But again and again this faith had been denied in the event, at least so far as this life is concerned: the Maccabees who would not break the Sabbath by fighting were slaughtered to a man. The

<sup>1</sup> Matthew iv. 5, 6.

<sup>2</sup> op. cit., p. 63.

challenge of the doubters was then inevitable. 'Where is now thy God?' 'He trusted in God; let Him deliver Him now, if He desireth Him'—it was the sneer that Jesus was to hear on the Cross.<sup>1</sup>

The fact that this is the background of the present temptation is made most clear, however, by the recurring reference to Israel in the wilderness, which shows also that we are following the natural order in Matthew. The theme of the first temptation, the miraculous food, was found in Exodus xvi. In Exodus xvii we find the demand for deliverance renewed. Israel's journey has led them to Rephidim, where there is no water. 'And the people thirsted there for water; and the people murmured against Moses, and said, Wherefore is this that thou hast brought us up out of Egypt, to kill us and our children and our cattle with thirst?' Moses will have none of the responsibility. It is not his judgement that is being attacked, but Jehovah's. 'Wherefore chide ye with me? Wherefore do ye tempt the Lord?' Jehovah provides water, and the difficulty is overcome, but the story ends on a note of disapproval. 'And he called the name of the place Massah . . . because of the chiding of the children of Israel, and because they tempted the Lord, saying, Is the Lord among us, or not?'

In essence this is the same temptation as before, to lay down conditions for God's working: but the force of it is far greater. If God has truly chosen a man or a people, will He let His Chosen perish utterly? Will faith withstand even this possibility? It is not an unnatural reaction for the Chosen to challenge the Divine intervention, to force a crisis in which deliverance must be forthcoming, in order not merely to escape the threat of danger, but to find relief from the burden of doubt.

The problem was a bitter one, and it may be noted that the Deuteronomist interpreter of the ancient story had no inkling of its real bitterness. His emphasis is: 'Thou shalt do that which is right and good in the sight of the Lord, that it may go well with thee.'<sup>2</sup> His comment on the episode at Rephidim — 'Ye shall not tempt the Lord your God, as ye tempted Him at Massah'<sup>3</sup> — is little more than a pious exhortation. But for Jesus these were the only words in the chapter which could serve as an answer to the Devil's challenge, and we must understand them in a far deeper sense than their original author ever intended when Jesus quotes them.

For those who are conscious of a true relationship with God, not even the greatest extreme of suffering and danger, not even death itself, can justify the attempt to tell God what He must do. 'Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.'<sup>4</sup> This is not a positive answer to the problem of the disasters which overtake the righteous: it says no more than has been said, for instance, by the Book of Job, that the problem must be left to God, who can be trusted on other grounds. But Jesus is beginning where Job left off, and the foundation is laid for the more positive answer which He was to give later. Even deliverance in extremity must not be a primary demand upon the Son of God.

The last of the temptations carries the story of Israel in the wilderness to its climax. 'Again, the Devil taketh Him unto an exceeding high mountain.'<sup>5</sup> In Exodus xix the people come at last to Horeb, the Mount of God. The older

<sup>1</sup> Matthew xxvii. 43, quoting Psalm xxii. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Deuteronomy vi. 18.

<sup>3</sup> Deuteronomy vi. 16.

<sup>4</sup> Exodus xvii. 1-7.

<sup>5</sup> Matthew iv. 7.

<sup>6</sup> Matthew iv. 8.

commentators on the Gospel narrative suggest Mount Tabor or Mount Hermon as the scene of the temptation, but it is difficult to see what either has to do in a story which has such clear Old Testament parallels — once again clearest in Matthew.

The way in which the story is told, however, makes it obvious that we are not required to believe that Jesus literally went to Horeb, but that the narrative refers to mental pilgrimage. Luke at least understood it so, for he omits to mention the mountain, saying merely that the Devil 'led Him up'; while his statement that 'he shewed Him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time'<sup>1</sup> removes the whole thing into the realm of visionary experience. But even in Matthew we can see that the Horeb story has been assimilated to the Deuteronomic account of the ascent of Moses into Mount Pisgah, at the end of his life — the mount whence 'the Lord shewed him all the land of Gilead, unto Dan; and all Naphtali, and all the land of Ephraim and Manasseh, and all the land of Judah, unto the hinder sea; and the South, and the Plain of the Valley of Jericho the city of palm trees, unto Zoar'.<sup>2</sup>

The departure from the Horeb story is only momentary, however, being necessary to provide the material for the temptation. The Devil 'sheweth Him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them; and he said unto Him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me'.<sup>3</sup> With the last words we are back again on Horeb, for they are a direct attack upon the first of the commandments which Moses received there from the hand of Jehovah.

The temptation is often interpreted as being the impulse to use worldly methods to gain world dominion, thus admitting the Devil's authority in this sphere. Dr. Major says: 'Last of all, Jesus is tempted to resort to political means for the fulfilment of His Messianic office: to make the Maccabean heroes and the Zealot fanatics His model, and to seek by military force to establish God's kingdom.'<sup>4</sup> But the Gospels do not suggest that Jesus is considering method at all. The Devil offers to give Him the kingdoms. Luke stresses the fact that it is to be a gift: his Devil says: 'to thee will I give all this authority . . . for it hath been delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will I give it.'<sup>5</sup> The means by which the gift is to be obtained are not so much as mentioned.

There are in fact two elements in the temptation. First is the suggestion that the world is in the gift of the Devil, second the urge to seek it on the Devil's terms. Neither of these elements is new, nor peculiar to Jesus. It was the danger which met Israel immediately they began to settle in Palestine, that the land had its own gods who were other than Jehovah, and that in possessing the land they were in danger of being possessed by its cults — a danger which was increased rather than lessened by the belief of many loyal Israelites that Jehovah was the God of the desert rather than of the town. And it persisted for long years. It was the peril which Elijah fought on Carmel: 'How long halt ye between two opinions? if the Lord be God, follow Him: but if Baal, then follow him.'<sup>6</sup>

Most important of all, however, from the point of view of the present study,

<sup>1</sup> Luke iv. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Deuteronomy xxxiv. 1-3.

<sup>3</sup> Matthew iv. 8, 9.

<sup>4</sup> Major, Manson, and Wright, *The Mission and Message of Jesus*, p. 28.

<sup>5</sup> Luke iv. 6.

<sup>6</sup> 1 Kings xviii. 21.

## IN THE WILDERNESS

is the fact that the danger is already met with in the Horeb story. According to Exodus xxxii, even while Moses was in the mount receiving the commandments of Jehovah, the people demanded that Aaron should make them gods to go before them; and when Aaron had made them a calf of molten gold, they said: 'These be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt.' There could not be a more striking background for the opening words of the Decalogue: 'I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me. . . . Thou shalt not bow down thyself unto them nor serve them.'<sup>1</sup>

It was a temptation which had continually to be faced. The Deuteronomic account of the vision allowed to Moses on Pisgah reflects one victory when God says: 'This is the land which I sware unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, saying, I will give it unto thy seed.'<sup>2</sup> Elijah won another in his day. But such perils inevitably recur with each generation in new forms. The disasters which had befallen Israel throughout her sojourn in the Promised Land, and her subjection to one foreign power after another, from Assyria to Rome, had led the people to believe that authority over the affairs of this world was in the hand of 'the Prince of this world'. No doubt Jehovah was believed to be ultimately in control, but there was more than a touch of Persian dualism in the Jewish notion of the Devil in Jesus' time.

What we have already said about the first two temptations shows clearly why the third arose. If in this world the Chosen of God were not to be sure of relief from bodily need, were not even to rely on deliverance from complete disaster if it came upon them, why should they worship God at all? Why not worship the power in whose gift lay wealth, comfort, prosperity? It is a challenge to the very foundation of the Mosaic religion, as laid down on Horeb. Then Jehovah had fed His people, and had delivered them from destruction, and on the mount Moses had received the first great commandment: 'Thou shalt have no other gods before me.' Here the guarantees of worldly well-being and safety are refused, and the Devil says: 'All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt bow down and worship me.'<sup>3</sup>

Once again there is little in the Book of Deuteronomy to serve as answer to such a challenge, for the problem had never fully come home to its author. The words which Jesus quotes came more glibly from Deuteronomic lips, and there is a far deeper experience and a finer courage behind them as Jesus speaks; indeed He changes them a little, perhaps to stress His conviction. 'Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God; and Him shalt thou serve'<sup>4</sup> says the Old Testament writer, with a lively sense of benefits received. Jesus meets the fiercest assault of the Devil, without the comfort either of physical well-being or of personal security to buttress His courage. 'Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.'<sup>5</sup>

This is scarcely an argument. Jesus makes no attempt to deal with the question whether the Devil has or has not this authority which he claims, nor with any possible reasons why he may appear to exercise it. It is not an argument, it is a statement of faith. The Son of God will yield no jot of His Father's claims in face of any apparent victory of evil.

<sup>1</sup> Exodus xx. 2-6.

<sup>4</sup> Deuteronomy vi. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Deuteronomy xxxiv. 4.

<sup>5</sup> Matthew iv. 10.

<sup>3</sup> Matthew iv. 9.

Can faith in God hold out against the challenge of physical need, of death or disaster, of the apparent victory of the Devil in the world? These were questions which the nation Moses founded had been trying to answer ever since his day. When Jesus came they needed to be answered more than ever, for the old attempts to find a solution would serve no longer. Popular clamour demanded a Messiah who should deal with the problem by delivering Israel from the need, by averting the disaster, by conquering the Devil openly in the name of God. And no man possessed of any human sympathy could fail to be attracted by such a possibility.

But was it not a greater insight which realized that such a deliverance would only relieve the urgency of the problem without beginning to answer it? Was it not a more vital necessity that the Lordship of God be proclaimed even in time of need or disaster? Who but a spiritual genius of the first order could have chosen the more difficult but far more urgent task? Who but such a genius, undertaking a review of the work which God had done for His people in time past, could have laid His finger so unerringly upon the points where the deepest significance of that work was to be discerned? And who was that genius, if it was not Jesus Himself?

We may admit freely that there is no positive answer to the problem of the suffering of the Elect in the temptation-stories. That was to come later, in the magnificent fulfilment in action of the dream of the Second Isaiah: 'Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows.' The temptation in the wilderness is but a clearing of the decks for action. Nevertheless, it was an essential preliminary for the ministry; and we may well feel that it was not unfitting for Jesus to think deeply upon the record of the ways of God with the Old Israel before He set His hand to the recreation of the Israel of God.

CHARLES F. DAVEY

### SPIRITUAL LIFE AND LITERARY TRENDS

COWPER'S familiar line expresses the moaning plaint of this stricken generation. For us, as for the distraught poet, 'a closer walk with God' is a consummation much to be desired. Our unhappy minds confess a state far removed from 'a calm and heavenly frame'. Church and people labour, and long for refreshing grace, but lack inspiration to pray in the spirit and with the understanding also. Prayer which should provide wings falls upon us as a burden to be upborne: the problems it should solve, it seems only further to entangle. There would seem to be no health in us.

It is no misfortune, at any time, to be dissatisfied with the soul's progress. What is most to be feared is complacency — 'the ghastly smooth life'. Every step forward in the path of blessedness increases the pangs of hunger and thirst after righteousness. The means available to assuage desire are so meagre as only to intensify the sense of want. 'Within the motive of worship', says Hocking, 'there is to be discerned a weariness of the old, the habitual, the established.' No liturgy or form can ever perfectly symbolize, far less satisfy, the impulse towards perfection.

But what we suffer now, is not from the normal pains of a developing spiritual life. Our condition resembles a traveller who imagines himself on the right road, but suddenly wakes up to discover that he has left it — how long ago he does not know. Hour after hour, he has gone round in circles. We walk aimlessly around, hoping to strike the path. We are despondent; tired; worn out.

Spiritual fatigue, like other forms of fatigue, has dulled our wits, depressed our spirits, and left us on the edge of hopelessness. We have lost belief — not in prayer — but in our own prayers and in our ability to pray with reality. We do not attend prayer meetings, we dub them 'old fashioned' and find amusement rather than admonition, from memories of the prayers of our forebears. We still go to church but often sit uneasily in worship. And if our oratories have not been demolished, they have certainly suffered from blast. We seek them more from habit than with expectation of refreshment and renewal. The *malaise* is not peculiar to one church. Friends speak sadly of the flickering 'Inner Light'; the Roman Church is driven to consider improvements in her liturgical forms.

If we talk little about our spiritual state, it is not because it is something 'too sacred to discuss' — an excuse that used to be common — we are silent because we are despondent. And should any come forward, crying with loud mouth, 'Eureka!', or babble of forms, techniques, and vestments, we should raise our eyebrows ever so slightly, or more likely dismiss any such as belonging to that miserable tribe of spiritual charlatans.

There seems to be only one word to describe our religious mentality — frustration, a frustration so patent because of its symptom — disillusionment. Though the symptom is much the same as that of other kinds of frustration, the cause is buried so deep that we have almost despaired of finding it. We are 'the house divided against itself', but what has riven it asunder?

An explanation often put forward is that we are not as spiritually-minded as our fathers, and consequently suffer from poverty of spiritual experience. Sinners no doubt we are, but that we are greater transgressors than our forebears may be much open to debate. A more plausible statement of the condition — not so often advanced — is that we are unfortunate in the period we have to live in. It is our lot to have entered another of those dark ages in history. Our portion is to suffer and endure, to learn that they also serve who only stand and wait. All that remains for the guardians of the Temple is to go on feeding the dim lights on the altar, praying for a more open vision. Perhaps the Church has wandered so far into the wilderness that all her members alike must do penance and wait upon God's discipline.

Were we obliged to regard ourselves as exiles, condemned to live as unenlightened strangers in an alien land, we had nothing better than to hang our harps upon the willows. We should have to discard even the symbols of praise and prayer. We are not so condemned. Our restlessness and distraction spring from a spiritual and not a psychological cause. We are aware that periods of dryness are inevitable in times of transition, but are followed by signs of abundance of rain. We even dare hope that we have been called to such a time as this to throw up a firm highway in the desert for those who come after us. It hardly seems likely that any single person will arise as leader of faithful souls. We know that there are few advances in science that were

not anticipated or shared by others. And since spiritual illumination often comes from a multitude of tiny flares brought to the darkness of the temple, 'twould be a sin against light to conceal one's insight though little more than a rush light'. At this point it would seem better to drop the impersonal 'we' and write of one's own convictions as an individual.

For the latter half of my ministry I have been greatly concerned with the problem of prayer and taken part in many discussions about it. Quite recently I came across a sentence in Mannheim's book, *Man and Society*, which represents the drift of my own thoughts:

Only to those who love the cloistered life can the nature of thought appear as purely contemplative, as self-contained and not as an instrument of life and action. In life as it was originally lived, there was no thought which was not action, thought by its very nature was determined by the situation.

I must not stop here and try to show that for the great Contemplatives, such as Teresa and St. John of the Cross, the word 'contemplative' meant the opposite of dividing off the devotional from the practical life. But I shall come back to that point later. It was the idea of there being a time when thought and action were one that dropped a match into the gunpowder. I did not at once see the implication of this sentence to the life of prayer and worship but, as the reader will see, I did realize later how relevant it was to the state of spirituality to-day. I let my mind play on the life of literature. I remembered something that Gilbert Murray had written, a good many years ago, about the quality of the writing of the Greek poets. He said that many great writers were not professional writers, but first and foremost men of affairs—generals; farmers, busy with their estates; men playing their part in public affairs. Their writings were by-products of these interests, transcripts from life. One remembered how Shakespeare's plays were written. They were shaped in the tumult and disorder of the theatre: the prototypes of the characters appearing on the stage, often provided in the immediate neighbourhood. The two great periods of drama — fifth-century Athens and Elizabethan England — owed almost as much to the sheer circumstance of reality as to the inventive genius of their playwrights.

'Thought and activity!' How far to seek was this combination to-day. Since the days when thought and action went hand in hand, a gulf began to be formed between literature and life. So there has arisen an order of writers out of touch with the main stream of humanity, disliking it intensely, and doing its best to escape any contact with it. Thus we got in literature, 'the cloistered life . . . self-contained and not an instrument of life and action'. Such monasticism had an unnatural effect upon the written word. Not less upon the character of the writers. The aim of literature was no longer to confront the totality of life and hand on an imperishable impression; instead, it became concerned with 'slices of life'. Exaggerated importance being given to segments, the universal note became lacking. This was all in the direction of confusion and lost vision. Certainly those who made it their business to keep us informed of their reactions and repulsions succeeded only too well in providing a distorted picture of reality.

There were, fortunately, sensitive writers who began to tremble at their own lawlessness, notably Aldous Huxley. He turned his back upon his salacious novels and sought spirituality in extreme forms of mysticism, both Oriental and Western. But no one writing from a Christian standpoint had provided what was so badly needed — an anatomy of spiritual frustration — except T. S. Eliot. Niebuhr and Berdyaev had written profoundly analytical works, but there had been no outstanding devotional theologian since Von Hugel. But if I mistake not we shall soon realize that in Eliot we have not only a Christian poet of outstanding merit, but one who will also have served as a Spiritual Director. For I do not know of any writer on spiritual things who has probed deeper than this poet and art critic, nor any who has drawn attention so clearly to the fact that a new approach and understanding of the spiritual life is required of this generation, if there is to be any advance of Christianity.

First, Eliot makes us realize the perplexing disunity in the spiritual life of the times. He is the poet of frustration. In regard to frustration, it may be sufficient here to call attention to the fact that for him the beginning of diagnosis and the recovery of values must be in tackling the meaninglessness of words.<sup>1</sup>

Our concern was speech, and speech impelled us  
To purify the dialect of the tribe.

We understand, of course, that in tackling the problem of words he was doing more, he was going down to the fount and centre of the interior life; we realize that he was concerned in the purification of the spiritual life, of which words were but material symbols and forms. The important thing for him was that his own use of words must be directly connected with the depths, rising from them as simultaneously as bubbles from some hidden cause below.

In the spiritual life of our churches, nowhere is disunity so obvious than in words and services that are often divorced from the activities they once con-nated. Our habit of cheating ourselves with words would be revolting if the insincerity of it were realized. When we temporarily awake to a sense of unreality in religion, we usually resort to the mixture as before, in stronger doses from a larger bottle with a brighter label. Could we take to ourselves the moral of the poet's scrupulosity in wrestling with words we might have found our way to an anatomy of frustration, we might have made a beginning of a closer walk with God. In *East Coker*, Eliot speaks of 'a raid on the inarticulate'. This is long overdue. In the same stanza of 'a fight to recover what has been lost', though he is aware that the conditions are 'unpropitious' He claims no success for his efforts — 'For us, there is only the trying. The rest is not our business.'

Secondly, the importance of Eliot is his own experience, which we may study with a view to discover how the disparate elements of reflection and volition become fused into a unity. We may find evidence of this in his fearless self scrutiny, a scrutiny so impartial and unflinching that it might have been exercised upon someone other than himself.

<sup>1</sup> The author and publisher are indebted to Messrs. Faber & Faber, Ltd. for permission to quote from the various works of T. S. Eliot.

First, the cold friction of expiring sense  
 Without enchantment, offering no promise  
 But bitter tastelessness of shadow fruit  
 As body and soul began to fall asunder.  
 Second, the conscious impotence of rage  
 At human folly, and the laceration  
 Of laughter at what ceases to amuse.  
 And last, the rending pain of re-enactment  
 Of all that you have done, and been; the shame  
 Of motives late revealed, and the awareness  
 Of things ill done to others' harm  
 Which once you took for exercise of virtue.  
 Then fools' approving stings, and honour stains.  
 From wrong to wrong the exasperated spirit  
 Proceeds, unless restored by that refining fire  
 Where you must move in measure, like a dancer.<sup>1</sup>

In *The Four Quartets* we can trace the mental processes of the poet's mind, as in a more elaborate fashion in Wordsworth's *Prelude*. Like all mystics, he reaches a unified experience by coming down to the ground of his own nature, by a gradually coming to himself, which is also a coming to God. But there is this important respect in which Eliot differs from the general description of mystics and their experiences. Whereas the mystic segregates himself from the world, sets himself free from the busy engagements of life, Eliot seeks to achieve integrity in 'all the uproar and the press of human business'. He does not renounce his poetry, nor the wholesome stimuli of society, but he uses his job as means of attaining the spiritual life, regarding his poetry as much a part of spiritual life as the minister his preaching. And just as a sculptor may only become aware of the image he desires to create when he comes in direct contact with his material, by which his efforts are conditioned, so Eliot's vision grows with the growth of himself and the development of his work towards perfection.

The result is a conception of the spiritual life, not as anything different from man's normal life and endeavour, but as life set free, and purified, to reach its destined end.

If the spiritual life is one and undivided, the attempt to live life as it should be lived is prayer. 'Interior prayer' would be the drive of his spirit in obedience to the constraints of the Holy Spirit, whilst worship and private prayer would be of the same character but specialized acts. The relation of specialized acts to the praying life would be similar to lock gates on a river enabling the vessel to reach higher levels. Most of our praying is done inwardly and unconsciously.

Inside of us there ought to go on a steady, daily, hourly process of relating ourselves to the Divine Goodness, of opening our lives to His warmth and love, of steadfast surrender to Him, and of sweet whisperings with Him such as we can tell no one about at all. . . . The internal prayer-life is carried on after one has left the quiet room and gone back to the noise and hubbub of the family group. It is carried on as one dashes for the trolley, as one lunches in a cafeteria, as one puts the children to bed. There is a

<sup>1</sup> Little Gidding.

way of living in prayer at the same time one is busy with the outward affairs of daily living.

Thirdly, there is implicit in Eliot's poetry the confession that it owes its inspiration to the illuminating and controlling power of Christ. Writing as a churchman he contends vigorously for doctrinal Christianity, but it is rather in his creative work as poet and essayist that we get gleams of personal relationship with God. This is too deep a matter to go into very far, but there is a beginning to all recovery and enlargement of the spiritual life and this beginning for Eliot, as for all of us, is in an ideal relationship set up between the soul and God. To say that it is ideal is to put that relationship in the future, and to say that it is something hoped for, not yet attained. But what can be helpful to us is to read Eliot with a view to discovering what happens in his own endeavour to establish a new and ideal relationship with God.

First, the relation sought is with One who is able to satisfy the demands of a spiritual life conceived in terms of this worldliness, without being what is meant by 'worldly'. The ideal relationship envisaged is with the Incarnate Lord, the Ideal Humanity, advancing in history as represented in the Ephesians. Secondly, it is a vision always in a state of becoming. It never takes definite, or at any time, the form of a clear-cut image. But it is a vision continually feeding experience. There are moments when, as we read, we feel we are trembling upon a revelation and are about to be informed of something extraordinary — 'Here, the intersection of the timeless moment.' But this passes. 'We must be still and still moving into another density.'

'You must go by a way wherein there is no ecstasy.' Much more important than anything seen, we are permitted to feel, every now and again, something of the poet's own experience at the stage reached. That there should come upon us this sense of 'awareness' is proof that the poet brings authentic tidings of invisible things. Eliot is a difficult poet to understand. I do not think he is really difficult to feel. Here it will be relevant for me to say that more than once I have stopped at some memorable sentence and the word 'contemplation' has formed upon my lips. The final impression that *The Four Quartets* has left upon my mind is that here are four short poems, each of them meditations, each of them examples of 'Interior Prayer', but prayer that fits in to the category of 'the Prayer of Quiet', 'the Prayer of Contemplation'. In *Little Gidding*, the spot where Nicholas Ferrar in the reign of Charles the First built a small chapel in which to worship undisturbed — he writes:

You are not here to verify,  
Instruct yourself, or inform curiosity  
Or carry report. You are here to kneel  
Where prayer has been valid. And prayer is more  
Than an order of words, the conscious occupation  
Of the praying mind, or the sound of the voice praying.

Here we are at the heart of Interior prayer and, perhaps, all we need is the reminder that the whole outgoing of heart, mind, and soul is to the felt Presence of God in Christ, to the Word made Flesh, to One in whom eternity and time, heaven and earth, spirit and flesh are one Unity of being.

Father Augustine Baker says that if any man would persevere out of a clean heart in prayer, he would inevitably come to the prayer of Contemplation. We have not in this discussion been led to the highest reaches of that kind of prayer, but we have seen its beginnings in 'Interior prayer'. The best and simplest description of Contemplation is in a little book in which, to the best of my memory, the word 'Contemplation' is not used — *The Practice of the Presence of God*, by Brother Lawrence. What we need is Brother Lawrence brought forward and embodied in a Christian of to-day. But the spirit of the book is for all time. Every line is a singing witness of a life enjoying a close walk with God, of one breathing the atmosphere of 'a calm and heavenly frame'.

There is one little-noticed feature in the book to which I must call attention. In Lawrence's view, religious acts, times of worship, sacraments and masses, emphasize a disunity in the spiritual life that should not exist. 'He was more united', he said, 'to God in his outward employment than when he left them for devotion and retirement.' Again, 'the time of business does not differ from the time of prayer, and in the noise and clatter of my kitchen, whilst several persons are calling for different things, I possess God in as great tranquillity as if I were upon my knees at the Blessed Sacrament'.

Brother Lawrence calls for a postscript. One comes across folk with the most rudimentary experience of prayer who imagine that they can reach at a jump the spiritual perception of Brother Lawrence. It is necessary to warn them that the equivalent of four-finger exercises is as necessary in the art of prayer as in learning to play the piano.

In such a subject as this I am well aware that I am out of my depths and feel that it is a little presumptuous to write about it; but I hope I have succeeded in passing on my own conviction. It is that the nearest approach that we can make to reality in prayer is the kind of prayer that we are mainly engaged in. This is 'Interior prayer', the response we make to the action of the Holy Spirit to will the will of God in the daily life. It is from this kind of prayer, which is freer from insincerity and unreality than any other form of prayer, that we should find our data and not in formal acts of prayer.

'Interior prayer,' purified and perfected, becomes 'the prayer of Contemplation'. Our own interior prayer suffers too much from our sinfulness to be regarded as the canon by which we judge prayer; we must needs study the great Masters. It is in the light of what we can learn about the prayer of Contemplation become truly Christian, i.e. a union of the spirit with the Incarnate Christ in his redemptive activities, that we should study the condition of the spiritual life and prayer at the present moment. We must begin with the End, for it is the end that should determine the beginnings. To forget this is to put the eye to the wrong end of the telescope.

J. HENRY BODGENER

## MAN AND HIS FREEDOM

THERE are certain passages in Romans which have perhaps had more than justice done to them by commentators; in the multitude of expositions there is confusion as well as wisdom. But there is one which has been unduly neglected, though a close examination of it shows that it has as valuable a contribution to make as any other. I refer to the discussion of freedom in vi. 15-23. In what follows I want to offer, not so much a detailed exegesis of this section as an account of freedom which is throughout heavily indebted to it.

To begin with, freedom is a property of the self as a whole and disappears from sight once we begin to break up that self into component parts which we speak of as motives, the will, and so on. When we do that, we substitute a mechanism for a living totality and so falsify the whole situation with which we are dealing. I am not determined by my motives, for my motives are integral to my self and not separable from me as forces which exert upon me a certain pressure. I exercise freedom as a total self which takes up the past, lives through the present, and shapes the future.

But if that is so, it follows that freedom is not an everyday affair, but is only fully exercised at certain crucial moments. I live at second-hand more than I am sometimes willing to admit; my actions arise out of the inertia of habit or are determined for me by the environment to which I conform as the easier course. Even in what I consider my free acts, I am seldom implicated as a whole; I act merely out of some partial interest which for the moment is able to have its own way. It is only rarely that we gather up our whole selves for a decision and stake our all on what we do.

It is with such a crucial action on the part of the total self that Paul is concerned in this section of the epistle; freedom is for him the decision between alternative allegiances. We are not at liberty, that is to say, to direct our lives as we please, but only to select the ultimate loyalty by which we are henceforth to be ruled. Man in this world must needs belong to something, and it is left to him to decide to what he will belong. We can of course refuse to commit ourselves in this way, and many seem to do this: they go through life apparently without any guiding star. Yet that is in itself a decision and a commitment. For the first question which life puts to us is whether we intend to be persons or things, characters or products of our environment. If we are ever to be good, we need first to become strong and unified. Alas! we may prefer not to do that, but rather to go on our way weak, listless and futile.

The second decision that is required of us is in some form the decision between good and evil, though it will usually appear merely as that between the better and the worse. Such a decision is in most cases neither overt nor conscious; it is arrived at as the by-product of something else, the choice of a profession, the formation of friendships or of habits, and so on. Here an illustration from war may be helpful. As the battlefield is seen from the ground-level it may present a most complicated pattern of inter-locking positions, so that the artillery is unable to fire, for fear of doing as much damage to its own side as to the enemy's. But seen from above it alters its character; it is possible then to see that all movement is in one of two opposing directions, and that what we thought to be confusion in fact conceals a deadly opposition between two armies at grips.

This basic choice then is for a certain ultimate loyalty and as a consequence our destiny is to a considerable extent thereafter fixed by it. ‘Know ye not, that to whom ye present yourselves as servants unto obedience, his servants ye are whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?’ The initial choice makes character, and so it limits the sphere within which we shall choose henceforth, it determines the general trend of our development. If a person has committed himself to truth, it is no longer an open question with him whether he shall be truthful under a given set of circumstances. He has bound himself as servant to truth and continues to obey it as his master. So in these rare, fateful moments of critical decision we pledge ourselves and our future; we continue to be what we became then once for all.

In the last paragraphs of the *Republic*, Plato shows us the souls of men after death, each choosing the lot which is to be his when he returns to life in the world. A modern interpreter<sup>1</sup> of his philosophy has found in this a conception of freedom which runs parallel to the one which we are considering here. The myth attempts to express the basic act which lies behind the thousand and one actions which make up our life, the act by which each person, as a total self, decides at once his character and his destiny. Our fate springs in this way out of our freedom, for it is we who decide what we afterwards become. A similar view of the myth is to be found in Plotinus.<sup>2</sup>

The same thought is expressed thus by W. E. Hocking: ‘This is the essential freedom of the self, that it stands for a fateful moment outside of all belongings, and determines for itself alone whether its primary attachments shall be with actual earthly interests or with those of an ideal and potential Kingdom of God.’\*

But does not this carry us much too far? Is the decision arrived at in this ‘fateful moment’ an irrevocable one? If we made the wrong commitment then, are we for ever bound to it? To this Paul would clearly answer that we are not so bound. It is true that the basic choice imposes certain limits upon us henceforth: but it does not annul our freedom. That remains and it can break through those limits. In other words, we retain still the power to revise our initial choice, if we come to see that it was mistaken, and to transfer ourselves from one allegiance to another. It is of course the transition from evil to good that Paul has particularly in mind: ‘Thanks be to God, that, whereas ye were servants of sin, ye became obedient from the heart to that form of teaching whereunto ye were delivered; and being made free from sin, ye became servants of righteousness . . . As ye presented your members as servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity, even so now present your members as servants to righteousness unto sanctification.’

It is important to see where Paul stands on the question of freedom. He is neither on the side of Luther nor on that of Erasmus. He knows quite well that evil is not an incident in, but a characteristic of, the self, that those to whom he is speaking are in a very real sense not free, because they are in bondage to the past. But it is to their own past they are in bondage and not to any alien and external power. Therefore their essential freedom — freedom to choose a master — remains with them in spite of everything, so that a new and healthful

<sup>1</sup> Stöcklein: *Über die philosophische Bedeutung von Platons Mythen*, 34 f.

<sup>2</sup> *Enneads*, III, 4 f.

\* *The Lasting Elements of Individualism*, 23.

commitment is possible. They can be set 'free from sin, and become servants to God'.

Let me now complete the quotation from Hocking: 'Individuality is not a fixed membership, as of an organ in an organism, but a continued living tension between various possibilities of belonging'. The view of freedom as confined to certain crucial moments in life is after all only a rough-and-ready one. It takes into account only the obvious instances of spontaneity, when the hard crust of habit is broken through or brave resistance is offered to the environment. But it is a mistake to suppose that the overt instances of determination are the only ones; much goes on below the surface-appearance of life which is of at least equal importance. Can we not then construe freedom as 'a continued living tension'? That is what Paul does in vii. 7-25.

The closer we make our examination of human actions, the more clearly do we see that the basic choice, once made, does not really close the issue for ever thereafter; it has to be re-affirmed again and again amid changing circumstances. The picture of man's situation in vii shows how freedom is involved in all our conduct, how the self has to maintain itself in a series of moment-by-moment decisions.

It is not only that we are faced by alternatives between which we must choose: each of these has an ally within ourselves. Good has as its ally 'the inward man', 'the mind', and evil 'the flesh'. Paul's language here is suggestive of a dualism, as though reason and the body were principles of good and evil respectively, but probably he does not mean as much as this. I suspect that the 'flesh' has to be understood in the light of Old Testament psychology. It is a psycho-physical entity and corresponds to what we should speak of as human nature in the raw. It is a whole mass of impulses and tendencies which lie dormant till stimulated by temptation; while not in itself evil, it lends itself easily to its purposes.

We might speak of man as containing within himself impulse and conscience, the thrust to action and the capacity for passing judgment on that action in the light of moral principles. Conscience is brought into play by education, the process by which each generation takes over the standards of its predecessor. But by the time conscience is prepared to judge, impulse is committed to courses of action which it cannot approve. This happened, to be sure, in all innocence, but the harm is now done: what was originally a mere natural tendency now becomes a forbidden one. A division is introduced into the self, a struggle is set up between conscience and impulse which is so frightful that the victim of the conflict feels himself to be torn asunder between the combatants. The more extensive the enlightenment which conscience receives, the farther does one feel oneself to be from what it demands: 'We know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin.' The highest aspirations are crossed and countered by the basest suggestions; it is as though there were a subtle mind somewhere bent on one's undoing. 'Sin, finding occasion through the commandment beguiled me, and through it slew me.'

One question forces itself upon the man thus rent by inner conflict: on which side in the struggle does his true self stand? At first, one is inclined to think that the true self is with conscience. The self, that is to say, is essentially sound; what has happened is that a misfortune has befallen it, an alien force has

somehow found a lodging within it. If that could only be expelled, all would be well, for the real self would remain intact. 'It is no more I that do it, but sin which dwelleth in me.'

Many men would be satisfied with that conclusion; but it does not satisfy a Paul or a Luther. The man of absolute moral earnestness must carry the self-analysis a stage further. He comes to see that what is wrong is not in his actions but in himself. Alas! it seems now as though the lower self in him were the true self, and the homage which conscience pays to the moral law were merely a theoretical concession to an authority one does not intend to allow to rule one's life. 'I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing.' From this point of view, man is essentially evil, and there is no deliverance for him except as he is made over again, re-born.

Yet the very fact that conscience can pass so stern a judgment on the self shows that it is no powerless visitant to it, but an integral part of it. Perhaps after all then the real self, the self which God can yet rescue out of this conflict, is on the side of good. 'If what I would not, that I do, it is no more I that do it, but sin which dwelleth in me.'

There is surely only one satisfactory answer to the question of the true self. It is that the true self is in this conflict, in the tension and division, the mingled hope and despair of it. Man is at once the battle, the battlefield, and the combatants. He is that creature who is not what he ought to be, who knows it and is ashamed of it, yet continues to be so. He is a traitor to himself where no other could betray him: that is at once his greatness and his tragedy.

Freedom is then continually imperilled and continually to be exercised; it is expressed not only in those fateful moments when the surface of life is broken through, but also in those apparently trivial occasions when nothing outward takes place. The two loyalties which compete for our allegiance sometimes stand before us and invite us to decision, but sometimes they enter into our inmost souls and the battle is decided now for one and now again for another in secret.

What we have outlined so far in relation to the individual can be detected on the much larger scale of history. The race, too, has its fateful moments and its continued living tension.

From time to time the succession of incidents which makes up history is broken through by an event of truly momentous character, one which gathers up the past in a creative act which sets its impress upon the future. Something occurs which fixes for generations the pattern of life for a whole civilization. One of the most obvious instances is the Industrial Revolution, the influence of which is being extended to-day to the peoples of Asia and Africa. Another was the American War of Independence, which brought a new type of society into existence and offered a refuge to lovers of liberty from all over Europe. We live to-day under the shadow of a third event, the Russian Revolution: no one is yet able to measure the import of that new turn in human affairs which began when the Red Flag was hoisted over the Kremlin.

Here perhaps Paul would reject the use that I shall make of his argument in v. 12-21. But I think it is not wholly illegitimate. The decisive events of history which fix the destiny of peoples are not to be described merely as social, political, or economic in character; they are that, but they also raise spiritual issues.

We have seen in our own day how a frontier-dispute, a bid for treaty-revision, or a biological theory can be the veiled form under which the age-old contest between good and evil enters into the world. In the crises of history man is being summoned to make his basic decision. He is being set before the ultimate possibilities of human life; in the language of the apostle, his destiny is fixed by Adam or by Christ. These represent for him the alternatives of disobedience and obedience, and each has a significance far beyond itself; each implicates the race and creates a tradition which goes down the centuries. 'As through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous.' This is to treat Adam and Christ as symbolizing the two ultimate allegiances between which man has to choose; as he commits himself to one or the other, so is his destiny.

But what of the other aspect of freedom, the 'continued living tension'? Here Paul's account is defective, for he does not bring out the fact that there is a fundamental difference between these two allegiances and the way in which they bind the race. Whereas we are involved in the sins of our fathers by merely being born into the world, we do not fully enter into their good qualities except as we identify ourselves with them. While, for example, submission to authority tends naturally to perpetuate itself, the love of liberty dies out unless it is renewed in each generation. In Paul's terminology, we fall in Adam without any decision on our part, by conforming to a world which is vitiated by the mistakes or follies of our ancestors; we rise in Christ only as we are willing to make our own the heritage of faith and goodness which has come down to us from God's servants in the past. So that in the race, as in the individual, freedom has to be exercised continually in conflict.

Behind the fateful occasions of history lie, as with ourselves, the multitudinous trivial incidents which seem to have no significance but which also have a part to play. The volcano erupts and scatters destruction far and wide; but who knows how long it took to gather the forces which were let loose in a single mad hour? The Russian Revolution was the product of centuries of oppression and many conspiracies; but who can measure the contribution to it of this or that individual and his misery or his revolt? Destiny is shaped by the events which pass unnoticed, and perhaps we decide most fatefully when we are convinced that nothing whatever is at stake. So for Christianity the supreme crisis in history is a trivial incident which no contemporary historian troubled to relate.

Freedom therefore is the making of destiny by the alliance of the self with powers from beyond the self. Our choice is between ultimate values, whether these come to us in striking challenge or solicit us in disguise. And the hardest, but the most necessary, discipline of our freedom is that we are not notified in advance which events are the fateful ones and which the trivial ones. That is for us to discern. Perhaps indeed in the last resort it is we who make events great or trivial by the manner in which we encounter God in them and turn to, or turn from, his purpose of good.

E. L. ALLEN

## THE PHILOSOPHY OF BERNARD SHAW A Study of 'Back to Methuselah'<sup>1</sup>

NO living writer has expressed himself with greater brilliance and force than Bernard Shaw. He has preached at us continually, in season and out of season, for nearly sixty years. Yet his philosophy as a whole remains obscure. Often, while we are enchanted and dazzled by his argument we are in serious doubt as to what purpose he is arguing. There are several reasons for this, the chief being the lack of intellectual discipline from which almost all literary prophets suffer. Shaw's command of language is amazing; but the technically facile always tend to be too easily satisfied with the brilliance of their own utterances. The academic philosopher is enabled, by his calling and training, to discipline and clarify his thought, whereas the man of letters, because he is more concerned with the multiplicity of experience as it operates in the field of literary art, frequently allows his gift of words to outrun his power of thought. Hence, when he has a message to deliver, when, that is to say, he takes upon himself the mantle of prophet, he is apt to turn into a hybrid who is neither altogether satisfying as a writer nor convincing as a thinker. This is particularly evident in the case of Shaw. His verbal fecundity has inhibited him from analysing his ideas sufficiently deeply; but there are other reasons in the sphere of character — his desire to make an impression, and his mental aggressiveness which is no less aggressive for being cheerful and good tempered. It is probable that this irritating habit of intellectual coat-tailing originated partly in the attempt to overcome the excessive shyness of his youth, and partly to the inheritance of his native land; but, however explained, it must be borne in mind in any consideration of his work.

The result of this excessive verbal brilliance, combined with a good deal of pose and aggression, has been to make Shaw too easily satisfied with mere argumentation at the expense of hard and concentrated thought. At the same time it is possible to extract a number of profound intuitions from beneath his surface word-play. Maritain would express it by saying that his intuitions have been imperfectly conceptualized — using the word intuition, not in the popular sense as referring to an awareness of reality independent of reason, but in the philosophical sense, as relating to the idea as it arises spontaneously in the mind prior to its formulation in the concept. The working out of dimly grasped intuitions through the process of conceptualization is a complicated, painful, and laborious activity in which the mind often goes astray. But Shaw has never made any attempt to do this. His concepts spawn. Nevertheless he possesses a saving gift which transcends his imperfect dialectic and carries his intuitions forward: the gift of imagination. The imagination is the power in us of combining and working up images and ideas into original patterns, thus creating an element of novelty in our apprehension of reality. In the first case, the sphere of images, we have imaginative sensibility expressing itself in the arts: in the second, the sphere of ideas, we have imaginative reason expressing itself in the speculative sciences and philosophy. Both are present to some degree in all imaginative activity: it is a matter of emphasis. But in either sphere, the actual *process* of the imagination is fundamentally aesthetic.

<sup>1</sup> *Back to Methuselah* is to be re-issued this year as a World's Classic by The Oxford Press.

Now Shaw's imagination works powerfully both in the sphere of sensibility and of reason, but chiefly in the latter; and whenever (as in the work of so many Irish thinkers, notably Berkeley and Swift) the imaginative reason is predominant, we shall find the best of him. Whenever he degenerates, as he so often does, into uncontrolled and exuberant dialectic his work inevitably suffers. Shaw is an artist: an imaginative thinker *par excellence*. It is seldom realized how great a part analogy and metaphor which are the tools of the imaginative reason play in his argument and in his dramatic construction.

Now the work in which Shaw's entire philosophy of life is most perfectly expressed through the imaginative reason is *Back to Methuselah*, in the Preface to some extent, but most vividly and characteristically in the cycle of five plays that follows. All the faults of undisciplined thought, self-contradiction, verbosity, pose, and intellectual aggression are here, together with that extraordinary admixture of half truths that made Chesterton say that 'Shaw has talked more sense and more nonsense than any man alive'; but through it all rushes a torrent of imaginative power that imparts to the whole a unity, grandeur, and coherence found nowhere else in his work. It is his *Ring*. And just as with Wagner *Die Meistersingers* may be a finer work than any single part of the *Ring* without being comparable to it in greatness of conception, so no single play of Shaw — not even *Saint Joan*, perhaps the greatest of them — can compare with *Methuselah* in this respect. On account of its length it may be that the work will be more often read than seen; but even in this form it is enormously impressive and effective. Shaw's imagination takes possession of his intuitions and presents them with a sincerity that affects us deeply, whether we agree with him or no.

From *Methuselah* emerge certain great truths that are contained in all Shaw's work, though nowhere else are they so fully developed; and, albeit, expressed within the framework of imperfect and often false concepts, we find on analysis that they are at one with the perennial beliefs of mankind. At the deepest levels of his being Shaw is reaching out to the existence of God, the perfectibility of the universe, and the brotherhood of man. Unfortunately these truths are often lost beneath the ambiguity of his concepts, and in order to try and get clear on his meaning we must consider these concepts in some detail.

From a very early age Shaw rebelled violently against the mechanistic and deterministic doctrines of Victorian materialism. He saw, with absolute certainty, that there is creative purpose at work in the world. The inner core of his mind seized upon God; but he conceived of Him as a Life Force striving to attain deeper consciousness and self-knowledge in creation. Although he has never given any indication of having studied Alexander or Bergson, his view is somewhat akin to theirs. Alexander's conception of God-in-the-Making, and Bergson's Creative Evolution have much in common with the Life Force, and if he had studied them he might have been more exact and clear in his definition of what the Life Force is. But (as far as one can understand it) his conception is ambiguous and contradictory — as he himself seems to recognize at times. If it is to have any meaning, to be distinguished from the mere 'living principle' of materialism, the Life Force must be God in the fullest theological sense — an absolute, personal Being, distinct from the universe which is His creation. But Shaw's rebellion against the anthropomorphic deity of a certain type of

ignorant and debased Christianity is such that he cannot bear to admit the full theological attributes of his Life Force, so that he is torn between materialism and Theism and endeavours to effect a compromise of his own which lands him in the conceptual absurdity of a sub-rational Force willing Itself into consciousness and rationality through trial and error. If he had thought out logically what he means by Life he would have arrived at a very different notion of deity. For when we ask ourselves what Life is apart from any particular manifestation of it, we find that in so far as we can pronounce on the subject at all, it must be absolute self-consciousness. That which distinguishes living from non-living is consciousness. In the lowliest living things the consciousness is so rudimentary as to be almost unrecognizable; but as the manifestations of Life increase up the evolutionary scale we find always a corresponding increase in depth and complexity of consciousness until we reach the emergence of personality; and finally, when we come to the highest living creature, man, consciousness, and personality have united to become self-consciousness. Since, therefore, the more fully Life manifests itself in matter, the greater is the intensity of consciousness, it seems only reasonable to conclude that Life Itself is absolute self-consciousness, i.e. Personal Deity. The only alternative is to deny that Life is something *informing* matter and to say, with the materialists, that what we call 'life' is simply a more complex *organization* of matter. This view Shaw rejects contemptuously. Yet he cannot bring himself (save in rare, sub-conscious moments of illumination) to accept the converse view that Life, as he conceives it, must be Deity.

The conception of the Life Force leads Shaw inevitably to the idea of the perfectibility of the universe. Here is another confusion. The perfectibility of the universe can only follow logically from the infinite activity of a perfect Being whose perfection continually overflows into the *perfecting* of finite values. In the words of Whitehead: 'Every act leaves the world with a deeper or a fainter impress of God. He then passes into his next relation to the world with enlarged, or diminished, presentations of ideal values.' If we once assume an imperfect being there is no possibility of perfection, since perfection can never come out of imperfection. If it is impossible for the more to come out of the less where it is only a matter of degree, not even the imagination of Shaw can extract the infinite-perfect from the finite-imperfect. He is therefore faced with the materialist-Theist alternative again. Either there is no progress or morality but merely blind matter in motion, or the living God made men to work out their individual destiny within His scheme.

A great deal of Shaw's confusion on these matters comes from the fact that he has never solved the problem of the ego and the Ego, the self and God. This problem has vexed almost all forms of Oriental religion, and in the West reached its culmination in the German Romantic, philosophers, writers, and musicians—Hegel, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Goethe, Wagner, and the rest — whom he so much admires. Shaw speaks at one moment of the Life Force using us, and at the next of our using and creating It. He quotes with approval Nietzsche's dictum that power over self is the only power worth having, and he makes one of the Ancients in *Methuselah* say that 'you can create nothing but yourself'. This identification of the self with God is behind all conceptions of the superman. What then becomes of his gospel of the brotherhood of man? He tells us

that the best way to realize such a brotherhood at the present stage of evolution is through world-socialism — which is nothing more than the establishment of an economic machinery that is the very reverse of self-creation and involves, in fact, a great measure of commanded servitude for the mass of men. Shaw's socialism represents the logical materialist development of his outlook: his approval of dictators and supermen represents the logical idealist development. But neither will get him the brotherhood of man.

It seems then that Shaw's position can be resolved into two directions: either a blind energy endlessly moving in a universe that is a-moral because infinite in end and without the possibility of reaching a goal, and in which man is a mere collective automaton; or a God who has created man to fulfil His own ultimately perfect end, to whom all men are bound in the relation of brothers to a father, and all of whom have the rights of brotherhood. There can be little doubt that it is the latter — God, the perfectibility of the universe, and human brotherhood — that represent his genuine intuitions. If it were not so all his work would be in vain.

Nowhere has Shaw succeeded in clearing up this conceptual ambiguity; but in *Methuselah* his imagination transcends his dialectical ambiguity. In *Man and Superman* he argued that we must breed a higher type to fulfil Life's purpose: in *Methuselah* he argues that in order to acquire the wisdom and experience to fulfil that purpose we must live much longer. At present, he says, we do not live long enough to outgrow our infantile selfishness. That most of us are in an infantile state seems obvious enough in the light of ordinary experience and of the findings of modern psychology. The majority of psychological schools agree that the pattern of neurosis is a regression to an infantile view of the world. But Shaw assumes that our infantility is biological rather than psychological — a necessary outcome of the present stage of evolution rather than a neurotic regress. Nevertheless he believes that we could live longer if we would.

This latter argument is set out most fully in the Preface. It is less satisfactory than the Plays because, although Shaw is working primarily through the imagination, he is restricted by his medium. He is, however, considerably more clear and to the point than in many of his earlier Prefaces. At the same time the argument suffers from lack of adequate construction — a weakness of all Shaw's prose writings. The middle section might have been briefer, and the whole Preface would have been more effective if he had put the critical part first and the constructive afterwards. Yet it remains an impressive piece of work, and carries us away with its youthful vitality and optimism. He shows, from Lamarck and others, how organism and mind develop in response to an inner urge, a thrust forward, instead of blindly by Circumstantial selection; and he argues that the urge to live longer would produce a longer life just as the giraffe's urge to reach higher produced a longer neck. 'The Miracle of Condensed Recapitulation' in which the whole life of the world is gone through in the human foetus in a few months might, he suggests, be carried farther, and the years we now waste in developing from infancy to so-called adulthood could be encompassed pre-natally, thus giving us a start at an age in which we are now mentally children:

The time may come when the same force that compressed the development of millions of years into nine months may pack many more millions into even

a shorter space; so that Raphaels may be born painters as they are now born breathers and blood circulators. But they will still begin as specks of protoplasm, and acquire the faculty of painting in their mother's womb at quite a late stage of their embryonic life. They must recapitulate the history of mankind in their own persons, however briefly they may condense it.

This may be unscientific: but it is not impossible, and shows the range and force of Shaw's imagination. Indeed it is, as he says, the imagination that provides the motive power of change. 'You imagine what you desire; you will what you imagine; and at last you create what you will' — a sentence which reflects his own essentially imaginative genius in spite of his boast as a dialectician. Shaw would say that when we all imagine the kind of thing he imagines in *Methuselah* it will come to pass.

In the great cycle of five plays which he calls, very aptly, 'A Metabiological Pentateuch' he imagines what might happen if we decided to live longer in order to enlarge our experience and understanding. He begins in the Garden of Eden. Genesis tells us that our first parents ate of the Tree of Knowledge and brought death into the world, and Shaw interprets this in his own inimitable way. In the first scene, Adam and Eve, the creations of Lilith who sundered herself in twain because the burden of creation for one would have been unbearable, are faced with the prospect of living for ever until the serpent tells Eve that they may renew themselves (as she does by casting her skins) through the miracle of birth, but at the price of individual death. In the second scene, a few centuries later, Adam and Eve have begotten many children, but they are idle, wasteful, and warlike. Cain boasts of the glories of war, but Eve tells him that among her many children are some who will carry on the torch of life rather than of death. 'They never want to die, because they are always learning and always creating either things or wisdom, or at least dreaming of them. And then you, Cain, come to me with your stupid fighting and destroying, and your foolish boasting...' But, she adds, 'Through him and his like, death is gaining on life. Already most of our children die before they have sense enough to know how to live.' And on this note the first Part ends. The second Part is set in the period just after the Great War (when the cycle was written) and suffers from Shaw's unquenchable weakness for topicality. Already much of it is stale; and there is little purpose served by the pseudonymous introduction of the two party leaders of the day, Lloyd George as Joyce Burge, and Asquith as Lubin. The one scene in which the play is cast is far too long, and many of the problems discussed are entirely off the track of the main argument. Shaw could not resist tilting at contemporary politicians. But in spite of this weakness, the play is exciting. The Brothers Barnabas, a philosopher and a biologist, have become convinced that we must live longer, and have written a book on the subject. The cook and the parlour-maid have been glancing at the book in secret, and the rest of the company, Burge, Lubin, Franklyn Barnabas's daughter Cynthia, and a young clergyman to whom she is engaged, discuss the book with the brothers. Shaw contrasts the futility of their lives, with what might be. 'A world without conscience: that is the horror of our condition', says Franklyn. The Brothers emphasize that greater longevity may happen anywhere without those who achieve it being conscious that they are

doing so; and in the next Part — 'The Thing Happens' — we find that, 250 years later in a world organized for efficiency and pleasure, the parlour-maid who only glanced at the book and the clergyman who was frankly sceptical of it have lived on, holding various important state offices and reappearing every three-score years or so under different names, pretending to be drowned when they wanted to disappear. Part Four takes us forward nearly 1000 years, when the long-lived inhabit Ireland, and the short-lived come to them from all over the rest of the world to admire and ask for advice they don't take. But the three scenes of this Part are undoubtedly the weakest in the cycle. Shaw exploits the humour of the situation by contrasting a well-meaning Elderly Gentleman with the 'youthful' long-livers who, though two or three times his age look young enough to be his children and persist in treating him as a naughty and irresponsible child. But it is too slight to stand the weight of its three scenes, and often degenerates into farce — as in the absurd introduction of a Napoleonic figure in the second scene. It is quite extraordinary how Shaw labours to prolong the thesis that the short-lived — in this case symbolized by the Elderly Gentleman — die of discouragement. But in the last Part, 'As Far as Thought can Reach' (A.D. 31,920) all the power of his imaginative genius is revealed at its height. The long-lived have inherited the earth which is in a pastoral condition. Internal nourishment and sexual generation have passed away. Children are born, at the equivalent of our twentieth year, from an egg — a dramatic representation of the argument on Condensed Recapitulation in the Preface. After a few years, in which the Newly Born play together at a level of our scientists and artists, they develop increasing powers of thought, and become solitary, eventually taking their place with the Ancients who have lived for thousands of years and continue to live indefinitely until an accident makes an end of them. In spite of its length, this final Part is never boring, and in spite of its theme, never gives the impression of absolute impossibility. It says much for Shaw's imaginative power that he can make us feel that such a world is possible — even though some of us may think it is undesirable. Towards the end the play reaches a climax that rounds off the entire cycle with an epic dignity very rare in Shaw.

Now although *Methuselah* must be regarded by anyone with a grain of imagination or literary and dramatic sense as a very great achievement, there are three vital questions which it leaves unanswered and, on that account, profoundly weakens the argument as a whole.

- (1) Can we live longer on the grounds suggested by Shaw?
- (2) If we lived longer should we be any better?
- (3) If we did get better, what is the ultimate end?

(1) We *can* live longer, Shaw says, if we really want to — that is, if we once become convinced that the purpose of Life, i.e. greater knowledge and power, demands it. Biologically his contention is possible. There can be no doubt that the element of striving in nature accounts for evolution more effectively than circumstantial selection. But the striving involves the purpose of a Will outside the striver to which purpose he strives. Again the confusion alluded to earlier between the self and God is apparent. But even if we grant the possibility of Shaw's premise, the probabilities against it are enormous. Meanwhile

the world goes to the dogs, and he can offer us nothing better than socialism which, he makes Conrad Barnabas say, is, with Democracy and Votes for Women, a sign of the end of a civilization — whatever that may mean. The real difficulty in this first question is, however, revealed when we attempt to answer the second and third questions.

(2) In answer to the question whether we should be any better if we did live longer Shaw would say that since we could only want to live longer *in order* to be better, it follows that we shall be better when we live longer. But is this certain? He admits the fact of regression in even the highest creatures: what guarantee, then, have we that many of the long-lived might not, like the Earl and his mistress in Aldous Huxley's *After Many a Summer*, regress to a perpetuation of loathsome indecency, or worse still, to an insane arrogance that would destroy all that had been achieved. Greater knowledge and power might be knowledge of God's purpose and power to do it: but it might equally be used for self-glorification, like the knowledge and power of Lucifer.

(3) But everything depends upon the ultimate end; and the attempt to deal with this difficulty involves Shaw in a complete *volte face*. Thus toward the end of the final play one of the Ancients says that after living for thousands of years they desire only to get rid of the body that imprisons them. 'For whilst we are tied to this tyrannous body we are subject to its death, and our destiny is not achieved.' 'What is your destiny?' asks the Newly Born. And the Ancient answers, 'To be immortal'. Now Shaw's position amounts to this — that he has sought to persuade us at great length and with great eloquence throughout the Cycle of five long plays that we need greater longevity in order to build a better world, the ultimate end of which is that the inhabitants will want to die. For that is what it comes to. They want to get rid of the body, that is, to die, so that they may enter into eternal Life. But this is precisely the aim of the Christian—except that he expects to die after three-score years or so instead of thousands. Shaw himself seems to recognize this in a speech he puts into the mouth of the Elderly Gentleman:

I accept my three-score and ten years. If they are filled with usefulness, with justice, with mercy, with good-will: if they are the lifetime of a soul that never loses its honour and a brain that never loses its eagerness, they are enough for me, because these things are infinite and eternal, and can make ten of my years as long as thirty of yours. . . .

And, one may add, one minute as long as a million centuries. However, in defence of his general position, Shaw would probably answer that on the premise of Creative Evolution the Life Force can only evolve *in time*, and that the Ancients, *through their longevity*, have at last reached the stage in time in which ultimate Mind is possible. But this does not help us much. You are not going to persuade people to live longer in order that thousands or millions of years hence the Force that created them may get a Mind — even if you can get over the absurdity that in order to create them it must have a purpose that already presupposes a Mind. This brings us back to the old dilemma of Shaw's brand of Creative Evolution outlined above: either materialism or Theism: either blind matter or an omniscient Creator.

There are other inconsistencies in this work, the strongest being that between Shaw's conception of the inevitability of violent death and the power of the Ancients over the body. He introduces the former notion at the very beginning of the first Play. Adam and Eve who, at that stage, are destined to live indefinitely, are horrified by the death of a fawn which has broken its neck. Shaw concludes that no matter how long we may live an accident must make an end of us some day; and in the final Play, one of the youths tells how an Ancient who was assisting at a birth was destroyed by a flash of lightning. Yet elsewhere the Ancients say that their powers of mind are such that they are able to grow extra limbs and heads at will — in which case it seems that the same powers can arrest death. The power that could grow limbs and heads at will could insulate lightning by growing organs resistant to shock, and could cope with every other death situation.

But in spite of these defects, *Back to Methuselah* is a tremendous achievement — an imaginative masterpiece of the highest order. At the end, through the mouth of Lilith, Shaw sums up his own inspired faith in life in a grandeur of language unique in the whole range of his work. The Ancients pass on their way: the stage begins to grow dark, and the children troop into the temple. In the darkness, Adam and Eve appear, and between them, Lilith. Adam and Eve justify themselves and are swallowed up in the void. And Lilith speaks:

They have accepted the burden of eternal life. They have taken the agony from birth; and their life does not fail them even in the hour of their destruction. Their breasts are without milk: the bowels are gone: the very shapes of them are only ornaments for their children to admire and caress without understanding. Is this enough; or shall I labour again? Shall I bring forth something that will sweep them away and make an end of them as they have swept away the beasts of the garden, and made an end of the crawling things and the flying things and of all them that refuse to live for ever? I had patience with them for many ages: they tried me very sorely. They did terrible things: they embraced death, and said that eternal life was a fable. I stood amazed at the malice and destruction of the things I had made: Mars blushed as he looked down on the shame of his sister planet: cruelty and hypocrisy became so hideous that the face of the earth was pitted with the graves of little children among which living skeletons crawled in search of horrible food. The pangs of another birth were already upon me when one man repented and lived three hundred years; and I waited to see what would come of that. And so much came of it that the horrors of that time seem now but an evil dream. They have redeemed themselves from their vileness, and turned away from their sins. Best of all, they are still not satisfied: the impulse I gave them in that day when I sundered myself in twain and launched Man and Woman on the earth still urges them: after passing a million goals they press on to the goal of redemption from the flesh, to the vortex freed from matter, to the whirlpool in pure intelligence that, when the world began, was a whirlpool in pure force. And though all that they have done seems but the first hour of the infinite work of creation, yet I will not supersede them until they have forded this last stream that lies between flesh and spirit, and disengaged their life from the matter that has always mocked it. I can wait:

waiting and patience mean nothing to the eternal. I gave the woman the greatest of gifts: curiosity. By that her seed has been saved from my wrath; for I also am curious; and I have waited always to see what they will do tomorrow. Let them feed that appetite well for me. I say, let them dread, of all things, stagnation; for from the moment that I, Lilith, lose hope and faith in them, they are doomed. In that hope and faith I have let them live for a moment; and in that moment I have spared them many times. But mightier creatures than they have killed hope and faith, and perished from the earth; and I may not spare them for ever. I am Lilith: I brought life into the whirlpool of force, and compelled my enemy, Matter, to obey a living soul. But in enslaving Life's enemy I made him Life's master; for that is the end of all slavery; and now I shall set the slave free and the enemy reconciled, the whirlpool become all life and no matter. And because these infants that call themselves ancients are reaching out towards that, I will have patience with them still; though I know well that when they attain it they shall become one with me and supersede me, and Lilith will be only a legend that has lost its meaning. Of Life only there is no end; and though of its million starry mansions many are empty and many still unbuilt, and though its vast domain is as yet unbearably desert, my seed shall one day fill it and master its matter to its uttermost confines. And for what may be beyond, the eyesight of Lilith is too short. It is enough that there is a beyond.

Here is the best of Shaw: all his verbal power together with an imaginative range embodying intuitions of profound suggestiveness. Here also are his hope and faith and courage. But the problem of his work as a whole remains. Can his art endure when the dialectical superstructure which forms so large a part of it has collapsed? — for it is very doubtful if his verbose argumentation will make much appeal to future generations, and few of his plays have any great dramatic justification. What ought to endure, to gain for him immortality, is the imaginative genius that flowers in this great play-cycle, in *Saint Joan*, and in parts of *Man and Superman*. It may be that posterity will remember him chiefly as a unique personality; but it is certain that, in some form or other, he will live. He has left his mark upon our time.

ROBERT HAMILTON

## Notes and Discussions

### THE GOSPEL AND SOCIETY<sup>1</sup>

THESE two books may well be brought under review together, for they both deal with the Gospel in its bearing on Society. Yet they cover very different bits of the vast territory of that subject. Dr. Bodein's book recalls the name of Walter Rauschenbusch, pioneer of the 'Social Gospel' as it was misnamed in America, and, it will be remembered, by Harnack and Herrman. Dr. Ryder Smith gives us a penetrating

<sup>1</sup> Bodein: *The Social Gospel of Walter Rauschenbusch and Its Relation to Religious Education* (O.U.P. 20s.).

Ryder Smith: *What Do Ye?* A study in the Social Teaching of the New Testament (Epworth Press, 6s.).

## NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

exposition of the Social Teaching of the New Testament, in that exact and painstaking way with which his larger books: *The Bible Doctrine of Society*, *The Bible Doctrine of Wealth and Work* and *The Bible Doctrine of Womanhood*, have made us familiar. The contrast goes further. For Dr. Bodein writes with all the ardour of a disciple of the work and influence of a flaming prophet of social righteousness, while Dr. Ryder Smith bids us restrain our ardours and think of what we say.

We can certainly be grateful to Dr. Bodein for giving us a sketch of the life and career of Walter Rauschenbusch, German Baptist pastor and teacher of Lutheran descent in America, who, when his own social conscience had been awakened in his first pastorate in a New York slum, set out to stir the Christian conscience of America and awaken it to the fact that it had not only individual sins with which to reckon, but social sins as well. One wonders how many ministers of the younger generation know of the effect kindled on this side of the water as one after another between 1907 and 1917, Rauschenbusch's books came to us over the Atlantic: *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, *Prayers of the Social Wakening*, *Christianizing the Social Order*, *Dare We Be Christians?*, *The Social Principles of Jesus*, *A Theology for the Social Gospel*.

Needless to say, his emphasis on the application of the Gospel to society had its critics then as it has now, especially as the Barthians, the 'new-orthodox' as Dr. Bodein calls them, have turned the batteries of their wrath upon it. It was unfortunate that Rauschenbusch should have spoken as he did of the 'social Gospel', as it is that Dr. Bodein should follow him in doing so; just as, in any true understanding of the matter, it is inaccurate to talk of an 'individual gospel'. There is but one Gospel, necessary and adequate both for individual salvation and social redemption, and it is heresy to divide the Gospel and emphasize either half to the rejection of the other. The one extenuation of Rauschenbusch in his extreme emphasis on the social significance of the Gospel was that the Christian conscience of America, deep dyed in its devotion to individual salvation, and so hedged round by its faith in individual liberty, was so utterly oblivious of social evil and corporate sin.

A particular merit of Dr. Bodein's book is that it brings out so forcefully the root conception of Rauschenbusch's thinking and teaching, viz. his idea of the Kingdom of God. Doubtless a good deal of water has flown under the bridges since Rauschenbusch's day, and the discussion of that enigmatic idea has advanced far. Enough to say that for Rauschenbusch, the Kingdom of God was a present reality, to be progressively realized in the lives of men here — a view of it which easily lends itself to optimistic and Utopian dreams, from which not merely New Testament apocalyptic but the rude realities of human affairs effect a shattering awakening. But if Rauschenbusch was realistic about anything, it was that social evil was deeply entrenched, a grim reality which it was the business of the Christian to attack in the power of the Gospel.

Curiously enough, the weakest and least convincing chapter in Dr. Bodein's book is that which gives him half his title, that dealing with the relation of Rauschenbusch's interpretation of the Gospel to religious education. I will content myself with one quotation:

Rauschenbusch never worked out in any organized fashion the consequences for religious education of his concept of the Kingdom of God. His thought does, however, convey definite implications for the total educational strategy of the Church. There are four main ideas that have meaning for religious education — sensitivity to the existence of social evil, moral and religious rather than technical tests of salvation, salvation by essentially educational methods, and the Church as the indispensable factor in salvation.

Readers will work out for themselves what it means.

To turn again to Dr. Ryder Smith, it is quite significant that he, like Rauschenbusch, finds his key conception in the idea of the Kingdom of God. Speaking in his Preface of the first part of his book, dealing with the social teaching of Jesus, he says: 'An attempt is made to show that this describes an ideal, under the regulative concept of the "Kingdom of God", and that, so conceived, it forms an organic whole, since it falls under one principle and one motive.' Needless to say, Dr. Ryder Smith's discussion of the idea, particularly in chapter iv: 'The Christian Ideal', though brief, is competent and exact, and brings out the significance of recent discussions.

If I part company with him at all, it is in his use of the word 'ideal' in reference to our Lord's conception of the Kingdom of God. He quite recognizes, in his own words, that 'there is a sense in which God is king over the whole world now, in spite of all man's rebellions! Then a little later he says: 'But it is not in this sense that the phrase "Kingdom of God" is now in question. On Jesus' lips it is used of an *ideal* that is beginning to be.' One recognizes, of course, that there is a future realization of the Kingdom to be looked for and prayed for, as in the words of the Lord's Prayer: *Thy Kingdom Come!* But is 'ideal' the right word to describe this? For the Kingdom is also a present reality, the very form and order by which our lives are lived, even when we go contrary to it. Any emphasis on the 'coming' of the Kingdom has to be corrected by those other words of Jesus: The Kingdom of God is 'within you' or 'among you'.

For the rest, I want heartily to commend the book, not least for its chapters on 'The Home', 'The State and the Nation', 'Wealth and Poverty', The 'Labour Problem', 'Truth and Speech', 'The Church', and the ruthless realism of the chapter: 'It is expedient'. It is painstaking exposition at its best, and should be of value to many who want to know what guidance the New Testament has to give us for social life.

E. C. URWIN

## GOD IN HISTORY

THE writings of Dodd and Temple, MacMurray, Wood, Berdyaev and Niebuhr show us how important is the question: 'Is there a Revelation of God in History?' Is there an answer, if so, what is it? The present situation forces the issue. Professor Fisher in his history of Europe wrote: 'Men wiser than I have discarded in history a plot, a rhythm and a pattern. These harmonies are concealed from me. I can only recognize the contingent of the Unforeseen.' On the other hand, Professor Toynbee, a Christian believer, does find both a plan and a meaning, and in his monumental tomes illustrates his thesis of crisis, challenge and response, and quotes these words: 'If the Lord do not conduct the plan'. It appears therefore that whether you can pass directly from history to God or not, if you believe in God at all you will soon find Him in History.

Now there are different views of history.

1. The Hindu and mystical view which contemplates the eternal and finds no meaning in time.

(2) The Stoic view which sees nothing but a cycle of events without a goal.

(3) The inevitable progress school who were supported in Victorian days by Evolution or by the Humanistic Belief that man can accomplish what he wishes. This view has hardly survived two world wars.

(4) The Hebrew view which finds both meaning, purpose, and a goal because it believes in a personal God in touch with men, and stresses the vent which *happens*, the thing *done*. This is written in support of this view, which sustains the Christian view of history.

## NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

We find this view expressed in Old Testament history, the Prophets, and the Messianic elements there, and in the New Testament in the parable of the Husbandmen, Jesus' teaching about the fall of Jerusalem as a judgement of God, Paul's doctrine of an eternal purpose in Christ and the Book of Revelation with its teaching about a struggle between Christ and Caesar, leading to the overthrow of Rome as another Babylon and the coming of a new Jerusalem to earth. This view inspired the Puritans and Oliver Cromwell witnessed to it. Toynbee, like an Old Testament Prophet puts it forward. Civilizations rise and fall but the 'time of trouble' produces religious advance.

Is this view justified? There are reasons for justification. (1) It sounds reasonable, providing you believe in God. If there is truth in the religious experience of one believer, it would appear probable that God would show Himself in the experience of men together in the succession of events we call history. For history is not the biography of men great or small in isolation from each other, but the story of the life of people together in a time series. If He made the world surely He will be in its history. (2) There are happenings which seem like judgements, the fall of Babylon and Nineveh, the Decline and Fall of Rome, attributed by Toynbee to its own moral decay, the fall of Jerusalem, the French and Russian Revolutions resulting from appalling social conditions, two world wars proceeding out of failure in international morality and the emerging of anti-Christian views of life in Germany and elsewhere. It looks as if there is something in the universe which reacts against all the evil so that the tyrant and his tyranny cannot last. We seem to be witnessing at this time another manifestation of this truth. I should call this the Righteousness of God.

(3) There are redemptions, great movements of the spirit, especially noticeable in English history, but certainly not limited to that. We note the Celtic revival in the seventh century, the arrival of the friar, the monk, the Puritan and the Methodist, and the close connection between these revivals and secular progress can be noted. Psychology cannot account for this; it seems as if the supernatural disturbs the mind of man from beyond the world and renews his life in it. I should call this the Grace and the Love of God. Origen in the third century, and Dr. Oman in these latter days were surely right when they suggested a love wholly righteous, active in all the centuries of history, judging its sin and yet always working for ultimate redemption.

The question arises here, Is progress possible?

(1) It is not inevitable. There can be reaction and decay. It all depends on how people face the challenge of the crisis.

(2) Yet we must not fall into that undue pessimism which is sweeping the theological world in reaction from a too optimistic liberalism. Niebuhr tells us, for example, that a Utopia on earth is impossible, which makes us ask why the Lord calls upon us to pray 'Thy Kingdom come on earth'. There seems to be a reversal of Paul's teaching 'Where sin abounds Grace much more exceedingly'.

Now let us remember.

(1) The Grace of God with all its resources is active in the world, and as Dr. Oman used to tell us, it may not be blasted through the rock like a canal, but it will sweep round like a river and get there in the end, and we must always remember that the supernatural power is acting upon human life in that eternal love.

(2) Man's nature gravely tends towards evil, but it is not wholly evil, for there is a moral and spiritual nature which can feel a sense of frustration, fear, and dissatisfaction, and which can respond with faith to the Divine Grace.

(3) The universe seems to be so made that evil in it has no permanent place, and in fact, commits suicide. Love creates love is the goal. Thus we can well believe

that some great transformation of the individual and society is possible and that a new order, call it the Holy City or the Kingdom, as you wish, may be seen on earth.

However, there are two other factors to be noted. The renewal of life here may be very great, but it will always be finite and death will approach; there is an infinite aspiration in the heart of man which witnesses to eternal destiny. The final meaning of history is beyond history, and eternity alone can give value to time. Further, it must not be forgotten that in every generation the individual faces eternity, so that if the events of history prepare the individual for eternity, even if there were no transformed society here, these events would not be without significance for God and man. No doctrine of progress can overlook the eternal destiny of man.

There is one more important fact, and the greatest in the revelation of God in history. That fact is Jesus. Even Barth admits that God does appear at that point in time. Why he should refuse to believe he is revealed elsewhere is difficult to understand. Think for a moment of that fact, Jesus. He is a fact of history, yet of conscience and religious experience. He challenges the conscience with His imperatives and calls forth worship from the soul of man. He is unquestionably the greatest figure in history and so incarnates all the ideals, virtues, and values that we can conceive of nothing better than what we can see in Him. Everything that God should be, He was and is. Christianity stands and falls with the historic fact that God entered time in Jesus, was born of Mary and suffered under Pontius Pilate, and passed through a time experience which is not therefore opposed to eternity but included within it, enriching it with new values. The question may be asked, How can the perfect appear before the end of the succession? The answer is that Shakespeare, Plato, Phidias, Bach came in the midst of the succession and not at the end, but have never been surpassed in their particular spheres of life. Is it therefore surprising that the great standard in the sphere of religion should appear in the historic succession to dominate it? In the Cross He revealed love's sacrifice which can deal with sin by bearing it and overcoming it, and transforming its consequences to the accomplishment of a redemptive purpose thereby throwing light on the tragedy of human suffering, whilst taking this tremendous love sacrifice into the eternal plan gives it an ultimate, final, and absolute significance for man's salvation.

Thus this thesis has been maintained that God is in history, in revelation, judgement and redemption, that He speaks and acts in Jesus, who is the standard by which we judge history and the climax towards which history moves.

DOUGLAS W. LOWIS

### THE STORY OF MY LIFE<sup>1</sup>

To write a book at the age of ninety is of itself a remarkable *tour de force*, but more than that Mrs. Price Hughes has solved, by her life story, a problem rarely solved by autobiographies, she has written about herself without a touch of egotism. The incidents and events she records and her references to the famous people who tilt about her pages are little windows which illuminate her life of ninety years, and reveal, by the naive, objective, unselfconsciousness, with which she writes a strong and beautiful Christian character and much fine service to humanity.

Readers who realize that her life was spent in strenuous work amidst stirring scenes, and who know the prominent part she played in them, will perhaps be disappointed to find in these pages no vivid account of the Forward Movement, the romance of the West London Mission, the founding of the Free Church Council, the many controversies and the social and religious campaigns of her husband's career, in which she played a conspicuous part. There is relatively little about the wonderful

<sup>1</sup> Katherine Price Hughes (Epworth Press, 6s.).

Sisterhood she founded and guided, the early history of which was filled with novel experiments by women in days before the modern feminist movement took shape. But these events are not her theme, others must write about them; she contents herself with recounting her pleasure in the kindness of other people and her admiration of their services. She gives us no inside information, no scandals, no semi-malicious gossip, and even little — though what she writes is quite definite and explicit — about her own inner life. Yet it is here that we find in her realized presence of Christ and her unwavering obedience to His will, the motive and controlling force of her whole career and her strong and fragrant character. She does not know that she is doing this, but she really tells the story of a great Christian woman, sometimes as much by what she does not say, as by what she does.

Events of eighty or more years ago seem very distant to those of us who live to-day, yet it is strange how vividly they stand out in old age and how near early days seem to it. More details of her childhood are given by Mrs. Hughes than of any other of her life periods. She actually looks back to times when perambulators were novelties and thought to be rather impious novelties because they deprived the infant of warm maternal arms. How far away that world from ours, in which aeroplanes can reach America as quickly as Mrs. Hughes, in her childhood, could have travelled from London to Newcastle. Her book throws light on a side of Methodism little understood to-day; she sprang from a circle of substantial educated people who lived simple lives, however restricted their outlook, in a fervent and deep religious spirit. A grandfather who could, amongst other acts of worship, read a whole chapter from the Old Testament at Family Prayers, even when it happened to be the 119th Psalm is indeed a figure of another age. Yet the glimpses we get into that 'garden enclosed' of an earlier Methodism has a loveliness of its own which should never be forgotten. The reminiscences of a child's religious doubts and terrors express the thoughts of the hearts of many children who, like Mrs. Hughes, were born in the Manse. What a violent contrast there is between the early life of Manse and the theological college of which her father was Governor, and the aggressive Methodism in which she afterwards played no minor part.

Her husband was the man who broke down many of the walls of that sweet old-time denominational garden. A man of fire and storm, once described by his friend W. T. Stead, as a day of judgement in trousers — a description, it must be admitted, of only one phase of a rich, many-sided and indeed unique personality — whose vision of the Church was not of a 'garden enclosed' but of a city of God. He was a crusader rather than a gardener. Mrs. Price Hughes was his partner in the many adventures of the Forward Movement of the '80s and '90s — 'always we two' she rightly says, and yet her book is little concerned with fierce controversies and fiery crusades, but essentially the account of a quiet soul living in fellowship with Christ, always at peace amidst tumults and storms.

Many pages indeed of her book are not devoted to her brilliant career but to notes on holiday travel in many lands, Switzerland, Italy, the Holy Land, Egypt, America, India — yet these were only brief intervals in a continuous career of crusades and conferences which are indicated rather than described, although she served, as her book shows, on all sorts of important national committees, and one Parliamentary Commission, in addition to her many activities in the West London Mission. Her services finally were recognized by the King, who decorated her with a well-earned honour; and her praise is in all the churches. She was a pioneer in women's social work, and the record of the sisterhood she founded in rescue work, novel experiments in children's work, multifarious services on public bodies, would fill volumes, but in this book a few paragraphs hint at these values and leave the activities largely undescribed. Some welcome brief appreciations are given to the

Sisters and others, but there is no account of the long nights and days of toil, of onerous duties of the heavy burdens she bore so calmly. References are to be found to bereavements sore and heavy, but there is no note of complaint, no note of weariness or disappointment, only thankfulness to God. Gladness, contentment, pleasure in the work and service of other people, are the outstanding characteristics of this beautiful little book.

Others must write of the greatness of Mrs. Price Hughes, she is unaware of it; of the magnitude and courage of her work — she has not noticed them; of her splendid service to the community — to her it is a natural duty to be done simply without fuss or advertisement. Others, who knew and worked with her, however, can pay some tribute to the work and character of one of the great women of our time. With what trepidation (to use a favourite phrase of the author) the writer of this article went to meet, for the first time, Mrs. Price Hughes. He was then as a very young man about to take up the Superintendency of the West London Mission. Mrs. Hughes, as the head of the famous Sisterhood, with a reputation for militant feminancy, was regarded by those who did not know her as a very formidable person. With what surprise and gratification did he discover that she was quite human. Eighteen years of colleagueship with one whom he always reverenced was a privilege beyond reckoning. Never had a man so good a colleague, true, loyal, tolerant, profoundly Christian, though entirely lacking in all cant, always courageous, simple, and straightforward, he thanks God for such an association with a great woman and a true Christian, than whom no nobler daughter of Methodism has ever lived.

Her book is a charming little record which every Methodist should read. It preserves a memory of incidents and persons, of value to the historian of the future, but Katherine Price Hughes herself, inspirer as she was of bold experiments, cannot be packed into a volume, but lives and will always live in lives made better by her presence.

J. E. RATTENBURY

### JANE AND CHARLOTTE

THAT is to say, Jane Austen and Charlotte Brontë; though perhaps the explanation is not necessary. In August one has a few evenings of one's own, and I have spent them in re-reading, among other things, *Emma* and *Jane Eyre*. As I grow older I come to be of Charles Lamb's opinion, who said that when anybody recommended a new book he always took down an old one. Old books are comfortable, like old slippers; they are also ample; in a three-volume novel there is room to relax.

It was more or less by chance that I picked on these two books. Certainly it was with no idea of drawing comparisons, still less of joining in the sectarian dispute between the 'Janeites' and — what do the Brontë zealots call themselves? the Clement Shorter Catechists, perhaps. Still, when you turn, as I did, from the one writer to the other, the comparison forces itself upon you, and there is really no getting away from it. As a matter of fact the first person to make it, in all probability, was Charlotte Brontë herself. Mr. Clement Shorter, in his *Charlotte Brontë and her Circle*, quotes a letter of hers which contains this criticism of Jane, a criticism that brings out the deep temperamental difference between them:

I have likewise read one of Miss Austen's works — *Emma* — read it with interest and with just the degree of admiration which Miss Austen herself would have thought sensible and suitable. Anything like warmth or enthusiasm, anything energetic, poignant, heart-felt, is utterly out of place in commending these works; all such demonstration the authoress would have met with a well-bred sneer, would have calmly scorned as *outré* and extravagant. She does her

business of delineating the surface of the lives of genteel English people curiously well. There is a Chinese fidelity, a miniature delicacy, in the painting. She ruffles her reader by nothing vehement, disturbs him by nothing profound. The passions are perfectly unknown to her; she rejects even a speaking acquaintance with that stormy sisterhood. Even to the feelings she vouchsafes no more than an occasional graceful but distant recognition. . . . Jane Austen was a complete and most sensible lady, but a very incomplete and rather insensible (*not senseless*) woman.

'That stormy sisterhood': if Charlotte had been describing her sisters and herself she could hardly have found a better phrase. Genius can be a cruel gift; to those ailing girls it was a destroying angel; they had no means of bringing it under control, and it preyed upon them. For genius needs correctives and counter-weights — talent and knowledge and experience of the world, and in all these things the Brontë sisters were deficient. *Jane Eyre*, to speak of that more particularly, is undoubtedly a work of inspiration, but no one, I think, would call it a work of art. From that point of view it has almost every fault, and in places it is, to speak plainly, quite incredibly silly. We have seen what Charlotte thought of Miss Austen; what would Miss Austen have thought? she could have lived to read *Jane Eyre*? It is quite certain that she would have been amused by the things in it that are ridiculous, and who would blame her? and yet I feel sure that she would not have sneered. She was, as Charlotte said, a lady, but it is not merely that. The accomplished Miss Austen, who had all the talent that Charlotte lacked, whose taste was so impeccable and whose neat and delicious artistry never failed her, might nevertheless have found in *Jane Eyre* that which reduced her in her own eyes and left her abashed and wondering.

What is it? It is not altogether easy to express, but I find one clue in Charlotte's use of the word 'insensible', or as we should say insensitive. She was repelled by what she felt to be a certain hardness in Jane Austen. That she herself *felt* as few people are condemned to feel, fortunately for themselves — and as Jane Austen certainly did not feel or ever could — is clear enough. She was of course called upon to endure shattering sorrows; that gloomy parsonage on the Yorkshire moors was truly Heart-break House, a place marked down for tragedy, but it was not that alone. The truth is that she was one who must have suffered, whatever her circumstances, for hers was a suffering nature.

There is a phrase of Shelley's in which he speaks of one whose spirit was

a nerve o'er which did creep  
The else-unfelt oppressions of this earth.

Charlotte Brontë had this capacity for selfless sorrow, and it is her deepest, richest quality, the secret of her greatness and one of the sources of her genius. The things that she suffered in her personal life, cruel as they were and keenly as she felt them, were things which she could never regard as exclusively personal sorrows, uniquely her own. In this she was quite unlike her father. He could only shut himself up in his sorrows. He did not ask for pity, and it may well be that he would not stoop to pity himself, but neither was he moved to any pity for others; his sorrow was without charity. But Charlotte's was all charity. She wrote, it is true, out of her own experience, of things which she understood and of troubles which she herself had undergone; that was inevitable, and it was right. But it was not for herself that she was speaking; she was not a governess with a grievance. She was giving utterance to something which is universal — to what Yeats calls 'the greatness of the world in tears'. She knew that the cup of sorrow which was given to her was the common cup of which all must drink; she received it as the token of her fellowship with mankind, and in drinking felt herself to be in love and charity with her neighbours. This is the true

note of tragedy; it makes itself felt through the many crudities of *Jane Eyre*, and makes it, for all its faults, one of the great books of the world. And it is something that is quite beyond the range of Jane Austen.

But you cannot account for a thing like this by simply putting it down to 'sensibility'. Her capacity for feeling, her suffering nature, was a necessary qualification, but if we try to explain how it came to be lifted to such heights we must look for something further. And there can be no doubt at all where we have to look. *Jane Eyre* is not what is called a 'religious' novel — though the episode of Helen Burns reads uncommonly like a story from a Victorian tract — but it could only have sprung from a religious mind, and you can never understand it except in the light of Charlotte Brontë's own religion. It was because she was so deeply Christian that she was able out of her own sufferings to reap so rich a harvest of human sympathies. And in this connection it is interesting to recall that some of her strongest religious impressions came to her from Methodist sources. It is well known that copies of the *Methodist Magazine* which found their way to the Haworth Parsonage provided the Brontë sisters with some of their favourite reading. Whether they were the most fortunate literary models which the aspiring young writers could have found may perhaps be doubted; but be that as it may, the stories of religious conversion which they contained — 'earnest, wild, and occasionally fanatical' as Mrs. Gaskell says of them — must have brought home to the readers a strong impression of religious experience in its most vividly personal form. They cannot have failed to appeal to the naturally intense minds of the sisters, and to have quickened that sense of the spiritual drama that is played out in every individual soul to which they sought to give expression in their stories.

Now it happens that Jane Austen also was the daughter of a clergyman, but in her case you will look in vain for any trace of religious feeling, or, for that matter, of any interest whatever in religion. She is the complete Laodicean. The Church for her is simply part of the social scene; the vicar is the vicar, as the squire is the squire, and he seems to have nothing in the world to do except to dine out with his more genteel parishioners, and round off the novel by officiating at the inevitable wedding. Her moral values are unexceptionable as far as they go, but they are purely conventional. She likes 'nice' people, and has a healthy scorn for the ill-natured or the hypocritical; but she is not carried away by her feelings; she merely likes, or she dislikes. You cannot imagine any character of hers attempting to commit high-minded bigamy, like the astonishing Rochester in *Jane Eyre*; but if anything so improbable had ever occurred to her, we may be sure she would have treated the situation in the spirit of pure comedy, as no doubt it deserves to be.

And yet, does it? Charlotte certainly took it seriously, as she took everything; but so did Mrs. Gaskell, and was decidedly startled by such a piece of boldness, though she herself was considered quite an 'advanced' woman. The cheerfully-conventional view of social institutions which Jane Austen was content to accept was impossible to Charlotte Brontë. She was always conscious of the underlying moral issues, and the deep honesty of her character made her thoroughly realistic in her approach to all such questions. She could not put them aside, or take refuge in bland evasions or polite make-believe. It was an unheard-of thing in her day for a 'good' woman to raise even a tentative doubt about the validity of the marriage-tie, however it might turn out, or to suggest the idea that there are some marriages which are made, not in heaven, but in hell. Yet that is the idea which this bread-and-butter miss from the provinces had the temerity to put forward.

She raised the question — or rather she flung it out, for to her it was not a 'question', it was a passionate moral protest; but she did not discuss it. The time for cool

## EDITORIAL COMMENTS

discussion of such matters had not yet arrived, nor was she the sort of person who was qualified to conduct it. She had not the strength of mind or the emotional detachment which makes it possible to treat a human tragedy as a problem and to put forward proposals towards a solution. The only way out which she could conceive was a dramatic one. One cannot say that it was forced; that the mad wife should herself cut the knot by a last act of desperation was artistically fitting and, in the circumstances, probable enough. But I don't suppose that it even occurred to Charlotte Brontë that, apart from some such happy accident, there was any possible remedy for such human predicaments as these; *Jane Eyre* is not a Wellsean problem novel. The point is that she was stating a case which more conventional minds would not have dared to face, and she did it with such imaginative intensity that it remained in the memory of the world. The fact that hopeless insanity is now accepted as a ground for the dissolution of a marriage may perhaps be seen as an illustration of Shelley's claim that poets are the unacknowledged legislators of the world.

The truth about Charlotte Brontë is indeed just this, that she was a poet; in all essentials she answers to Wordsworth's description of a poet, as one 'endowed with more lively sensibility, more enthusiasm and tenderness, who has a greater knowledge of human nature, and a more comprehensive soul, than is supposed to be common among mankind'. Her vision of human life was the poet's vision, imaginative, discerning, and passionately sympathetic. It is one of the functions of such minds to call attention to human ills, but they must leave the rational consideration and practical handling of them to persons of a cooler temperament.

Jane Austen did not meddle with such high matters; they were beyond her. She knew her limitations, and was content, as an artist, to live within her means; and a wonderful job she made of it. She was 'a dainty rogue in porcelain', and I for one could not wish her different. Yet I can imagine her saying of Charlotte, if she had lived to know of her, what the 'faultless painter' in Browning's poem said of the rivals whom he knew to be his superiors in everything except in skill:

There burns a truer light of God in them,  
In their vexed beating stuffed and stopped-up brain,  
Heart, or whate'er else, than goes on to prompt  
This low-pulsed forthright craftsman's hand of mine.

W. S. HANDLEY JONES

---

## *Editorial Comments*

### SAN FRANCISCO

The Charter of the New World Organization has doubtless disappointed some people who had hoped for a document which would compare favourably with the Covenant of the League of Nations. To the idealist, determined to rule out present realities, it appears unsatisfactory. Certain undemocratic features, coupled with its acknowledgement of force as 'a necessary basis for future peace' might be criticized were it not for one stern fact. The world needs immediate security from the threat of war. Men are compelled to recognize a new and terrible realism in their present relationships. The conditions to-day are by no means identical with the conditions in 1919, and the need for stabilization is urgent.

In the House of Commons on February 17, 1800, Tierney challenged Pitt to define in one sentence the object of the war, 'without any ifs and buts and special pleading ambiguity'. 'I know not', said Pitt, 'whether I can do it in one sentence, but I can state it in one word. It is security — security against a danger, the greatest that

ever threatened mankind.' That surely would be the word which would indicate the immediate purpose of the deliberations at San Francisco. 'Judged from the standpoint of world morality,' says *The Observer*, 'it is a less noble document than the League Covenant . . . But it is a document more suited than the old to the weaknesses of the human race.' There will be those who will contend that no concessions should be made to such weaknesses, but they can only maintain their contention by minimizing the necessity for immediate security against a tremendous danger. It is true that the ultimate objective is the removal of the danger, but the first essential to removal is the creation of conditions in which men may learn to live together without the constant threat of war. Only in a world at peace can we hope to develop step by step, those increasingly Christian relationships which shall assure the permanent Peace. The findings of San Francisco are not, by any means, man's final Best! They can, however, produce conditions in which he may work towards the next stage.

There is a right and a wrong use of expediency. 'When it is not possible to follow the practices of the perfect Kingdom, do what will best serve its coming,' says Dr. Ryder Smith. In that sense the idealist may accept with thankfulness the results of the San Francisco conference. The ultimate goal is abiding peace for all mankind, but a condition of present security from war may help towards the growth of a new spirit of understanding and service by which the roots of war may be destroyed. San Francisco does not thrust us into a new and perfect world but it is the first milestone on man's new and perhaps greatest adventure.

### WAVELL AND SIMLA

Whatever may be the outcome of the Simla Round Table Conference it is evident that the patience and understanding of Lord Wavell is a powerful factor in the possible settlement of the Indian problem. *The Hindustan Times*, the organ of the Congress Party, said, 'Ultimately the success of the Conference will depend on the Viceroy's attitude'. *The Statesman* (Calcutta) commenting on the prospects at Simla, concluded: 'The Conference has so far displayed no acerbity, and the Viceroy has been acclaimed by all sides as an ideal chairman who has handled the discussions with fairness, frankness and firmness.' His opening speech to the Conference on June 25th was marked by a sincerity which must make its appeal to fair-minded people all over the world. After a spate of electioneering orations the Englishman at home will be relieved to read the words of his representative in India, as he approached the delicate situation at Simla. In the course of his address Lord Wavell said: 'Before we begin on the agenda of this Conference, the outcome of which will have a momentous influence on the destiny of India, I feel there are a few words I should say to you. First I welcome you all as men who, by character and ability, have risen to leadership in your Province and parties. I have called you together from all parts of India at this critical moment in her history to advise and help me in advancing India towards prosperity, political freedom, and greatness. I ask you to give me that help in the spirit of broad co-operation towards the good of India as a whole. It is not the Constitutional settlement, it is not the final solution of India's complex problems that is proposed. Nor does the plan in any way prejudge or prejudice the final issue. But if it succeeds I am sure that it will pave the way towards a settlement and bring it nearer. The statesmanship, wisdom, and goodwill of all of us here is on trial not merely in the eyes of India but of the whole world. I said in my broadcast that on all sides there was something to forgive and forget. We have got to rise above the level of old prejudices and enmities, and of party and sectional advantage, and think of the good of India, the good of 400,000,000 people, and how we can best combine to implement these new proposals made by the British Government for the advancement of India now and in the future. It will not be easy, and unless we can place our deliberations at a high

## EDITORIAL COMMENTS

common level we shall not succeed. You must accept my leadership for the present. Until there is some agreed change in the Constitution, I am responsible to H.M. Government for the good government and tranquillity of India. I will endeavour to guide the discussions of this conference in what I believe to be the best interests of this country. On the column which stands in front of the Viceroy's House, crowned by the Star of India, are engraved these words: "In thought and faith, in word and wisdom, in deed and courage, in life and service, so may India be great." They will make a good guide for our conference.'

Though the Working Committee of the All-India (Orthodox) Hindu Mahasabha condemned the Viceroy's plan as intended to 'camouflage the issue of India's independence and to break the solidarity of the Indian nation' Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru seemed prepared to consider it as an interim scheme — which, of course, it was. 'It is obviously an interlude,' he said, 'and if I feel that a brief temporary arrangement helps me in any way to attain my goal, I accept it.'

The Aga Khan cabling to Mr. Ghandi and Dr. Azad, from East Africa, urged Congress to consider a Constitution for an Indian Commonwealth of Nations 'based on a union of hearts and interests and not on majority force'. He pointed out that there must be proposals which dealt with an interim period before a permanent structure could be built.

Although, as we go to press, the disappointing result of the Simla Conference has been announced, we do not feel it was entirely without value. The generosity of Lord Wavell was obvious in his personal statement after the rejection of his proposals by Mr. Jinnah and the Moslem League: 'The Conference has therefore failed. Nobody can regret this more than I do myself. I wish to make it clear that responsibility for failure is mine. . . .'

In a public meeting at New Delhi on July 19th, Sir Frederick James, M.L.A., while regretting that the Simla Conference had terminated without agreement, said that it was remarkable how much goodwill and political activity was released by the announcement of the Wavell Plan and the Simla Conference. It would be the greatest possible tragedy if that goodwill were dissipated and political activity directed into non-truthful and non-constructive channels. For the first time for a good many years India had an opportunity to make a real effort. In spite of the difficulties raised by a section of Moslem opinion we believe Lord Wavell has paved the way for a further stage in the solution of the whole problem.

It would seem that in the minds of representative leaders as far apart as San Francisco and Simla there is recognition of the immediate necessity of establishing and maintaining order, so that, in a period of peace, the world may prepare the permanent Peace which all men of goodwill desire so earnestly. If the plans which are being considered can ensure an interim period of security it may be possible for a new understanding to develop amongst the people themselves. The nationalism which is emerging more strongly again on the continent of Europe as well as in the East, need not of itself be evil. If it is opposed merely by an internationalism based on force, it is certain that the future will hold perils of new wars. If, on the contrary, the contacts of the next few years are peaceful and friendly, so that national gifts are conceived as a stewardship held in the interest of the whole family of nations, then men may look hopefully to the future, bright with the promise of a new dawn.

### **DEMOBILIZATION AND EDUCATION**

Demobilization is gradually speeding up. It is the general opinion of men who served from 1914 to 1918 that the present scheme is a vast improvement on anything that was in operation in their day. In the final process care has been taken of the minutest details involved in the various stages of transition from 'service' to civilian

life. Practical necessities such as clothing, pay, registration, identity cards and transport are supplied; medical and dental examinations, advice on rehabilitation, training courses and re-employment are all provided. Opportunity is given to chaplains to make contact with each individual at some stage in his actual demobilization but these contacts are made deliberately informal. The whole machinery has been most carefully devised, but it would be a mistake to think of it as being operative only for the few hours during which the individual is at the final demobilization centre. In some senses demobilization began years ago! Its success or failure depends partly on what happened while the war in Europe and the Middle East was raging in full fury. At that critical time there were those who looked with undaunted faith towards the future. The whole question of education was considered and a comprehensive plan, capable of being adapted to meet the rapidly changing conditions, was developed. Its scope was astonishingly large.

In 1942 General Auchinleck, at that time commanding in the Middle East, wrote to the Commander-in-Chief in India: 'Service in the Middle East and contact with men of other nations has developed and changed the Indian soldier's outlook. I consider that it is of the utmost importance that this awakened interest be guided into channels which will be useful in good and stable government. The war-time education scheme is full of detailed ideas as to what can be done, and in my view they are sound ideas, which, if carried out, promise India a rich dividend in the future'. One must remember that India's huge voluntary army included hundreds of thousands of men from communities outside the traditional fighting classes. To quote an official document, 'the sepoy is now a very fair representative of the whole people'. The Indian Army recruit began his education at the training centre and that education included training not only in such subjects as mathematics but in citizenship also.

In the British Army one of the educational aims was to utilize qualities developed by active service — comradeship, discipline and team-work — in a post-war world. The matter was summarized by General Sir Bernard Paget, when he wrote to the men of his command in the Middle East: 'How are we going to ensure that, having won the war, we do not lose the peace as we did last time through self-indulgence and false doctrine? I have no doubt myself that the two main forces of insurance are religion applied to everyday life, and education applied to the man in the street, the ordinary citizen; and these two forces are complementary. Through education we may gain a truer sense of values: we may learn to appreciate the fact that freedom comes only through discipline and service: that we can have peace and security only if we are prepared to defend them: that we can attain to a better way of life only if we can learn how to make democracy work.'

One of the methods adopted, first by the Royal Air Force and now by the Army, is the establishment of Courses in Moral Leadership. These have already justified themselves, not only in English centres but overseas also. Those who have been privileged to share in them in Egypt, Palestine, Iraq, and Italy realize how amazingly they effected a transformation in the men and women who took them. The object was 'to further the development of ideals of leadership, not only in the religious faith and practice but in morale'. A most distinguished officer of the Royal Air Force has spoken of 'a resurgence of religious feeling, often ill-expressed, generally undenominational and frequently ill-informed'. This, one feels, is symptomatic. Men are anxious about religious, social and political problems. The establishment of these Courses enabled them, under competent and sympathetic guidance, to discover the key to their problems, and, by group discussions as well as by attendance at lectures, to arrive at logical conclusions. Many of them left the centre with new convictions and a real sense of responsibility. Moral leadership became Christian leadership.

Certainly demobilization at its best is not just a matter of 'de-kitting and re-kitting';

## EDITORIAL COMMENTS

it is much more than the acceptance of a bowler hat! It began years ago, perhaps in desert places, and it is accomplished when an informed person takes his place as a citizen, conscious of his responsibilities and aware of his privileges.

The education scheme in the Services has not by any means reached perfection, but it has lessened some of the wastage of war and reduced the time lag between war and peace.

### CHRISTIAN RECONSTRUCTION IN EUROPE

The work of Christian reconstruction in Europe has begun. Committees under the auspices of the World Council of Churches are functioning in France, Holland, Belgium, Sweden, Switzerland, the United States of America and Great Britain. Amongst the officials appointed to the Reconstruction Department in Geneva are the Chairman, Dr. Koechlin, who was President of the Swiss Protestant Federation, and Dr. Hutchison Cockburn, ex-Moderator of the Church of Scotland, who becomes Chief of the International Secretariat. The needs of the Christian communities are many and urgent. In France and Holland temporary barracks are required to replace churches, halls and schools. Pastors in France, Holland, Belgium, and Italy are working with totally inadequate salaries. Paper is needed for the printing of religious literature, and everywhere there is a shortage of Bibles.

In Great Britain the Churches and inter-denominational organizations under the auspices of the British Council of Churches have pledged themselves to raise £1,000,000. Small token gifts have already been sent. These have taken the form of money and theological books. The isolation of the occupied countries caused something like an intellectual 'black-out'. During the years of war the Theological Colleges were closed and their students were, of course, unable to procure English, Swiss or American books. Twenty-five libraries, each consisting of fifty English Theological books published during the war, have been sent to the occupied countries. Each book bears the inscription 'From the Christian people of Great Britain in friendship and gratitude'. The importance of the work of Christian Reconstruction cannot be exaggerated. Its influence on the re-settlement of Europe may become almost incalculable.

### AN APPEAL TO OUR READERS

During his recent visit to Italy the Editor had the opportunity of making contact with many of the Methodist and Waldensian communities. He was repeatedly reminded of the appalling lack of Bibles. This appeared not only as a desperate need but also as a great opportunity. On a visit to an advanced air base he was accompanied by a senior officer of the Royal Air Force. During the journey over war-torn roads in Northern Italy the conversation was, strangely enough, not about military operations but about the need for Italian Bibles amongst the local population. That was what was worrying the officer most! He was a man who had had a most brilliant career in the Air Force, but his great concern at the moment was that he might be supplied with Bibles to give to the numbers of Italian people who had asked him for them. The Editor promised to send as many copies over as possible. He would be most grateful to any of the readers of the *London Quarterly and Holborn Review* who could give him Italian Bibles. They should be sent to him at 25 City Road, London, E.C.1, and he will forward them to the officer concerned. The need is urgent and donors can be sure that every copy they are able to send will have many eager readers.

### RELIGIOUS PUBLISHING

For some time it has been the desire of the religious publishing houses that some kind of concerted action might be taken by them on matters of public importance. The Publishers' Association, to which they belong, has proved itself to be of enormous

value in the difficult conditions under which books have been produced during the past six years. On general questions this representative and powerful body has served the country well. There are, however, highly specialized problems which face those who are chiefly concerned with the publication of religious literature. Their responsibility is great and it was felt that if they, as specialists, could meet to consider their peculiar problems they might be able to find a common voice in the larger assembly of publishers in general. Similarly those concerned with educational and with medical literature felt the need for specific consultative bodies to prevent overlapping, to lessen unnecessary competition and to promote co-operative effort in the production of worth-while books. The Religious Publishers' Group of the Publishers' Association has therefore been established. It is interesting to note that almost the first question to be discussed was 'What is a religious book?' The debate not only produced a definition but elicited a great deal of information as to the relative value of certain types of modern publications, and revealed needs that may presently be met. The Chairman elected to preside at these initial meetings was the Rev. Edgar C. Barton, the Book Steward of the Methodist Publishing House. Twenty-one of the leading houses have so far been admitted to membership. We believe that the formation of this Group may have considerable influence on the future policy of religious publishing and therefore on the life of the whole nation.

LESLIE F. CHURCH

## Ministers in Council

THE 'COME BACK' OF PRAYER. The phrase is that of Gerald Heard in *A Preface to Prayer* (Cassell). He believes that amongst laymen there is a growing interest in prayer. The attack on this religious habit by the scientist and the psychologist has gone too far and now there is a reaction. Folk are no longer satisfied with the hospital test proposed by T. H. Huxley: let one ward in a hospital have the benefit of intercession and the other be without that aid and then see which patients recover. Against this are actual cases of faith healing. The theory of pure coincidence cannot obliterate the evidence for answered prayer. The psychologist has affirmed that auto-suggestion is the simple and final explanation of the benefits of prayer. His view is that it can alter character but not affect circumstance. Mr. Heard, however, disputes the validity of that objection, because the psychologist is not himself an experimenter: he will not take the risk of praying himself. A physiologist in order to gain first hand and up-to-date knowledge will take all dangers in experimenting on his own body, but the sceptical psychologist will not practise prayer for that involves spiritual hazard, the risk of becoming religious!

And so attention is being paid to the practical folk to whose determination to publish what they have found is so largely due the new interest in prayer.

What Mr. Heard has to say about these impressive witnesses and also concerning Christian mystics and the devotees of Eastern religion in his unorthodox but striking book is not our immediate concern. At the moment it is the acknowledgement from such a source of a keen and awakened interest in prayer that is of arresting importance to any student of the signs of the times.



A MISSIONARY ON THE PRAYER LIFE. Of the practical people mentioned by Mr. Heard a worthy place might be given to the man whose life story is told by Mrs. Howard Taylor in her book *Behind the Ranges: Fraser of Lisuland* (Lutterworth Press).

James Outram Fraser, B.Sc., had as a youth been organist at a Methodist chapel in St. Albans and there he attended the class meeting and taught in Sunday School. At

the age of 21 he graduated with honours at the London University. A career in engineering was before him. But when a fellow student gave him a little twopenny booklet, 'Do not say' containing a piercing and sustained appeal for service on the mission field he was greatly moved and dedicated his life to work overseas. From 1909 until his death in 1938 he spent himself unremittingly under the China Inland Mission in the province of Yunnan and on the mountainous regions near the Burma road with excursions into Burma itself. After long and arduous toil amongst the various aboriginal tribes he attained amazing success especially with the Lisu people.

From the time of his first initiation into Chinese life he learned to find quiet places out of doors. These became his prayer haunts, whether the hidden gully, the half deserted temple, or the open hillside. After four years' experience of the spiritual needs of the Christian worker amid heathen surroundings he wrote to his mother in England asking her to form a prayer-circle and promising to communicate with its members regularly. From these letters are derived glimpses of his own discoveries in the realm of prayer.

A fundamental lesson he learned was that prayer must not only be definite but accompanied by faith that takes the answer. Thus he had come to see that it was not enough to work for the conversion of individuals. The clan system was so strong that any effective and lasting change must be focused on the household. Families must be won to Christ. And so the petition rose in his heart that hundreds of families might put away their demon worship and turn in faith to Christ. But was it enough merely to present such a petition at the throne of grace and leave it there? Does not Hebrews iv. 16 suggest a faith that receives and finds what it asks. Did not the Master Himself say 'All things whatsoever ye pray and ask for, believe that ye have received them and ye shall have them' (Mark xi. 24).

Hence he wrote to the prayer circle that he had in the past wasted much time over prayer that was ineffective. Praying without faith, he said, was like trying to cut with a blunt knife.

It was also borne in upon him that there must be divine direction in prayer. For while John v. 14 gives the assurance that if we ask anything according to God's will He hears us, it is equally true that a petition not in accordance with the Lord's will cannot be granted. Therefore he was led to preface prayer with the definite request that he might be directed into the channels of prayer to which the Holy Spirit was beckoning him.

It also proved helpful to make a short list, like notes prepared for a sermon, before he engaged in petition or intercession. He would then put his prayer notes in front of him, kneel down and 'get to business'.

From 2 Corinthians x. 15 he gained hints of the territory which God is ready to assign for prayer-service to each intercessor and worker. An illimitable, undefined, continent of responsibility would be an intolerable burden and the attempt to labour on it unhelpful. The Christian is not, however, to be oppressed by the vastness of the religious work waiting to be done in the world but to ask how much of it is actually assigned to him personally. Thus as an illustration he quoted the willingness of the Canadian Government to make a grant of 160 acres and no more to a farmer emigrant making application for land. Why no more? Because the Government knew that the applicant could not work any more. They thus limited him to an amount of land equal to his capacities. Similarly as Paul put it there is 'a measure of the province which God apportioned to us'.

In his own prayer he had asked for the conversion of several hundreds of Lisu families. In the district, however, there were upwards of two thousand families, yet he was not led to ask in terms of thousands but only of hundreds. That was, he thought, the measure of the province which God had given him.

In working and waiting for the answer to this prayer Fraser derived encouragement from 2 Thessalonians iii. 5, 'The Lord direct your hearts into . . . the patience of Christ', and also from James v. 7, 'The husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth' being patient over it. Quick growth is shown in Matthew xiii. 5, to be a sign of the ephemeral.

But five years after his prayer of faith he could write that there were in one district alone in which he had been ministering over 240 families professing to be Christian, and, in all, about 450 families had come for teaching and shepherding.

Significantly to this absorbing study in the spiritual life Mrs. Howard Taylor has chosen as the title for her book words taken from lines in Kipling's *The Explorer*:

Something hidden. Go and find it. Go and look beyond the ranges . . .

God took care to hide that country. Till He judged His people ready,  
Then He chose me for His whisper, and I've found it. And it's yours.

\* \* \* \* \*

**RURAL LIFE AND PROBLEMS.** *Country Planning: A Study of Rural Problems* (Oxford University Press, 7s. 6d.) contains the findings of a team from the Agricultural Economics Research Institute, Oxford, as a result of a survey of a Midland rural area during the last six months of 1943 under the leadership of Dr. C. S. Orwin.

The picture thus presented may be described as depressing or provocative to action, according to the bent of mind of the reader.

That many country dwellers are discouraged is evident. Thus a small group of farm workers in an Oxfordshire village who had applied to the Workers' Educational Association for some winter's course declined the offer of one on land problems saying that nothing had ever been done to improve the conditions of life for rural labour, that nothing was likely to be done and that all they could do now was to see to it that their sons should not follow in their footsteps.

The drift from the land is frequently emphasized. One farm of 1000 acres in the survey area once within living memory employed more than 50 men. That farm to-day, split into three holdings, provides work for no more than 12 men. Taking the 21 villages as a whole in the survey area (of some twenty-four square miles) it was found that the population had dropped by 25 per cent in the last two generations. In some of the remoter parts of the country the decline is said to have been twice as much. Between the years 1923 and 1935 the number of farm workers not exceeding 21 years of age in Oxfordshire fell from 1931 to under 1000. In the preface the situation is summed up by saying that during the last sixty years the number of land workers has been reduced by one half.

It is declared to be an obvious fact that labour is leaving the land and that the younger generation is not being attracted to it. Moreover it is affirmed that so long as Britain remains a highly industrialized community this trend is not likely to be reversed, though its effects might be mitigated perhaps if life on the land were made more remunerative and its amenities improved. A young countryman is quoted as saying, 'Farming's no good. You earn the same at 60 as you do at 20 and once the war is over, I'm away'.

Rural housing calls for urgent attention. As a country plumber remarked, 'It's all very well to have a house that looks like a Christmas card but it's better to have one that's watertight'. Examples are given by verbal description and by photograph showing the wretched condition of many village houses. The writers ask that instead of inaccessible cottages, there should be accommodation for farm workers in the village and in houses so equipped that they would be able to draw water from taps and where gas or electricity would be available for lighting and cooking, where the roads would be metalled and the bus pass the door. The keymen for farm service could ride to and from their work on motor cycles while others would be picked up

by the farm motor van each morning and taken home again at night — as is done already in some parts of the country.

To Mr. S. G. Burden, M.A., of the Oxfordshire Garden Produce Committee, was entrusted the investigation into the religious life of the villages. He reports that on a particular Sunday it was ascertained that in one village with a population of just over 1000 the total number of worshippers at the Anglican, Roman Catholic, Methodist, and Baptist churches was 130 in the morning and 195 in the evening. The congregation consisted mainly of elderly people, the majority of whom were women, but it is admitted that the absence of many young people of both sexes in national service at the time of the survey might account for this in some measure.

\* \* \* \* \*

**'THE SCHOOL WITHOUT THE PARSON'.** Under this title Canon E. F. Braley, M.A., LL.D., deals with the subject of religious instruction of children in Council schools. Church schools do not come into his picture, except very incidentally.

His approach is based on what he terms the inability of the churches to serve the national religious interest. He holds that it is in the interest of the State that all children in the land should be taught the elements of the Christian faith and morals. But he has the conviction that Sunday Schools cannot cope with the task. Just before the war there were 5,169,443 children attending public elementary schools but of these he estimates that less than two million went to Sunday Schools of any kind. Of Secondary School pupils the proportion attending Sunday Schools was far less. Thus if five children be taken at random in England he is sure that not more than two are in touch with Sunday Schools (here he acknowledges that church day schools only provide for some 20 per cent of school children). He does not think that clergy and ministers can deal with the situation by religious instruction in their churches on week days. And so he is driven to the conclusion that to-day at least three-fifths of the children of England would be spiritually poverty stricken if it were not for the State day schools.

The Free Church reader may at this juncture naturally raise the question whether this does not represent too ready an acquiescence in the shortcomings of the churches in Sunday School work and weekday service and too quick a readiness to push on to the shoulders of the State the responsibility for the spiritual welfare of the children.

It is however refreshing to find him frankly acknowledging that in Agreed Syllabuses there is a fundamental Christian faith. He stoutly contends that there is a unity of the faith which transcends denominational divisions and that this can be introduced into State schools.

Canon Braley holds that the Council day school may constitute a worshipping community. As the large proportion of the people of the nation have no ecclesiastical home of their own, there must for their children be found a worshipping community in the day school — or they have none at all. At this point one cannot but ask: Then why do so many Anglicans seek to disturb the unity of this day school community by seeking to withdraw all the children they can to the parish church, thus breaking up so valuable a school worshipping communal life?

The author pleads for a better understanding between the 200,000 teachers in England and the 24,000 clergy and ministers of all denominations and in this plea there will be general agreement, though probably not on all the lines he lays down.

Major Selby Johnson, M.A., M.E.D., of the Rotherham School, has prepared a useful index to the book which is published by The Religious Education Press, Wallington (1s. 6d.). All Free Churchmen will appreciate the reasonable spirit which breathes through the pages of this small volume.

W. E. FARNDALE

## Recent Literature

*The Divine Realm.* By Evgeny Lampert. (Faber and Faber, 8s. 6d.)

The waves and storms which have swept over the Christian Church since the first World War have had curiously different effects in the West and the East. In the West the first prophetic voice was that of Karl Barth, with its echoes of St. Augustine amidst the crash of the falling world of the fifth century and of Luther in the turbulent clamour of the Reformation. The Eastern Church, never very sympathetic to the struggles of its brethren in the West, and recalling its traditional devotion to the Word or Logos (by no means the same as the Word of God as Barth conceived it), to the principle of community or Sobornost, and to the continuous creative activity of God, has for the most part preserved in its thinking a calm undisturbed even by the hurricanes of Bolshevism. It is as if, with Dostoievsky's Alyosha, it has moved through a seething world of passion in a mystical quiet, still conscious of the drifting of angelic wings. This is the impression made by a remarkable book from the pen of a young Russian scholar of Orthodox antecedents, who was educated in Germany and France, became a Christian, and for the last six years has been a research student in Oxford. It is easy to detect the influence of Berdyaev and Bulgakov, and Dr. Lampert acknowledges his debt to the late Professor Quick and to the Anglo-Orthodox Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius. But he is no mere reaper in other men's fields; and he has presented us with a book which, if it is read as carefully as it deserves, will leave a lasting impression on the mind of the student. He starts, as his title suggests, from the dominant conception of God as the Creator, God in relation to the world rather than God in relation to human sin and forgiveness. Here the difference from the West is at once evident. The leading thought and interest of the West, both Catholic and Protestant, can be found, for better or worse, in Aquinas. For Catholicism this is so now more than ever, since the Vatican pronounced him the authorized exponent of Roman orthodoxy. Now, for Aquinas, God is the First Cause, the 'Unmoved Mover'. The necessary being of such a First Cause ('and this is what we call God') dispenses with the other traditional 'proofs' and establishes religion securely on the basis of reason. But if this is logic, it is also illogical. If everything has a cause, the so-called First Cause must also have one. How can the chain end in a hook? This is the point which Dr. Lampert urges with skill and zeal. But he is more concerned with construction than with criticism. For him God is not the First Cause, nor is creation causality. Then what is it? It is self-revelation; it is the union of the subject and object; it is a 'mad' act of love. It is 'theurgy' or divine working; the world is ever being created and called anew 'to its theandric being'. Dr. Lampert has not forgotten the great Athanasian phrase for the Incarnation — 'one theandric energy or functioning'.

Does this help us? It not only helps us, the author would answer; it alone enables us to understand the world and ourselves. Creation is not the making of a thing, whether the material for it exists or not. It cannot be explained by any one of Aristotle's four sorts of causes. It is personal; it is self-impartation. It means love, sacrifice, suffering. It works through symbols, which represent or make present the eternal realities. Chief of these are the sacraments. The author of Genesis i. is right; God saw and sees all His creation as good. The earth itself is the revelation of God-mankind; 'she gradually unveils her theandric content'. Undeterred by any Western conceptions, ancient or modern, of depravity or the Fall, Dr. Lampert carries on his exposition of God's self-revealing creativity into the worlds of sex, economics, and art. Reality and symbol, the essential and the existential (to refer to a distinction now more familiar in the West than in the East), presupposes each other; and the highest of the symbols, the Eucharist, 'transfigures the elements of cosmic being and human existence'. Not all the learning of this talented author (to which the footnotes bear

abundant witness) nor his enthusiasm can completely commend or explain his thesis; nor can we give up Augustine and Luther as easily as we may give up Aquinas. A good many sentences are more arresting than convincing. But though we may give little time now to St. John of Damascus or Khomiakov, the tradition which has stretched over ten centuries is still alive, and has found a competent and thought-provoking exponent in Dr. Lampert.

W. F. LOFTHOUSE

*The Word as Truth.* By Alan Fairweather. (Lutterworth Press, 10s. 6d.)

In this volume Mr. Fairweather, a minister in the Church of Scotland, makes a scholarly contribution to the Christian doctrine of revelation. It is not an easy book to read but it bears the marks of a well-equipped and penetrating mind. Mr. Fairweather's method is that of constructive criticism. He examines the doctrine of revelation in the writings of St. Thomas and Karl Barth. The central theme is the mediacy of God's self-presentation to man. Mr. Fairweather welcomes the wholesome rationalism of St. Thomas as well as his insistence on the continuity of nature and grace. He differs from him — and it is permissible to disagree with St. Thomas — in at least two respects. Human finitude does not, as St. Thomas held, preclude the possibility of immediate apprehension of God. The subject-matter of revelation is not the hidden substance of God but 'God-in-relation-to-ourselves', and human reception of revelation is this relation viewed from the side of the recipient. Further, St. Thomas was fettered by his belief that names could only be applied to God analogously and this means that assurance based upon acquaintance with God Himself is excluded. Mr. Fairweather's treatment of Barth is more drastic. He rejects Barth's philosophical and anthropological presuppositions. Among these the more important are the beliefs that nature and grace are discontinuous, that sin has destroyed our capacity to hear the Word of God, and that revelation must be purely transcendent. The author holds that when Barth's presuppositions are pressed to their logical conclusion, they result in dissociating the idea of revelation from the idea of truth and depriving the Bible of all value for revelation. He would supplement the Thomist position by the Barthian emphasis on the real presence of God in His Word, and would so reconstruct the Barthian position as to relate it to the Thomist doctrine that no acquaintance with God is possible except through the rational apprehension of His nature. Mr. Fairweather, however, is careful to guard against a conception of revelation that is merely intellectual. He urges that there is no contradiction in the claim that we are directly acquainted with One who transcends understanding.

HAROLD ROBERTS

*A Plain Man Looks at the Cross.* By Leslie D. Weatherhead. (Independent Press, 6s.)

In the sub-title this useful and attractive book is described as 'an attempt to explain in simple language for the modern man, the significance of the Death of Christ'. This is a courageous undertaking, for the plain man is an exacting client who looks for quick results and is impatient at what seem to him to be the evasions and hair-splitting methods of theologians. Mr. Weatherhead is in no doubt about the difficulty of his task. He thinks that the plain man is not concerned about religion or does not think it is relevant to national and international aims. Even when such a man goes further, he is satisfied to think of Christ as a hero, or a martyr, or as the revealer of God. The idea of the Saviour is strange to him and he rarely thinks of himself as a sinner. At the same time Mr. Weatherhead thinks that we have not helped the plain man as we might have done, and in challenging words he voices the dissatisfaction of those who have failed to find light and meaning in the teaching of

theologians and the hymns of the Church. On the positive side, which happily is prominent in this book, Mr. Weatherhead seeks to describe how Jesus came to His Cross and what He said about it. He thinks that a development can be traced in the life and thought of Jesus which culminated at Tyre and Sidon and at Caesarea Philippi, and he summarizes His teaching in a striking passage — 'The words of Jesus about His suffering and death reveal that He willingly committed Himself to some mighty task, costly to Him beyond our imagining, but effecting for men a deliverance beyond their own power to achieve, and that in doing so He knew Himself to be utterly and completely one with God the Father'. Three chapters seek to unfold this statement. Mr. Weatherhead gladly recognizes his debt to Dr. Maltby, but he seeks to carry his exposition further. This he accomplishes by a luminous treatment of Christ's Self-Emptying and Age-long Humanity, His Self-Dedication and Betrothal to Humanity, and His Union with and Extended Incarnation in Humanity. Such a programme provides strong meat for the plain man, but the author knows how to stimulate his interest by telling stories and arresting illustrations. The last two chapters, on 'Justified by Faith' and 'Saved by His Precious Blood', are the best. They are calculated to bring help to all who have been puzzled or affronted by these phrases. We congratulate Mr. Weatherhead on a positive contribution to Christian teaching, which is 'popular' in the best sense of the word. His book is sure to meet the needs of many readers, to provoke them to further inquiry and challenge them to make the venture of faith. A useful Questionnaire provides material for Study Circles.

VINCENT TAYLOR

*A Compend of Luther's Theology*. Edited by H. Thomson Kerr. (S.C.M., 12s. 6d.)

The Associate Professor of Systematic Theology at Princeton Theological Seminary has been encouraged to undertake this work through the good reception given, by student and pastor alike, to his *Compend of Calvin's Theology*, published in 1939. No one will be surprised when Dr. Kerr says he has found his later task the more difficult. Some idea of the graphic power of Luther's pen is given, as, for instance, when he suggested that one who tries to defend God's Word, itself his only true means of defence, by the help of Reason, is like a fool, who in the thick of the battle would seek to 'protect his helmet and sword with bare hand and unshielded head', or when he warned speculative thinkers against 'going too far and too high, as sometimes happens to chamois hunters, and did happen to Origen'. The extracts are fairly comprehensive and are conveniently arranged under such headings as Revelation and the Bible, God, Jesus Christ, The Office and Work of the Holy Spirit, the Church, with appropriate sub-headings. It is thus possible to get an idea of Luther's thought on any of the salient doctrines of the Christian Faith in a very short time. Moreover, passages are included which reveal limitations and errors in his thought — for instance, in the section headed 'The Christian and The State'. Apart from two minor errors in the Preface, where Marburg is given an honour which belongs to Worms, and the reference in connection with Wesley should be to Luther's *Preface* to the Commentary on Romans (the Commentary itself was lost until more recent times), the chief criticism we would make is that the selections are limited to works already translated into English. Luther-lovers, however, will be grateful to Dr. Kerr for making a selection of representative extracts from Luther's numerous and un-systematized works.

PERCY SCOTT

*A Free Religious Faith*. Edited by R. V. Holt. (Lindsey Press, 5s.)

This book is a series of essays produced by a group of writers appointed as a Com-

## RECENT LITERATURE

mission by the General Assembly of Unitarian and Free Christian Churches, on the main aspects of religious faith in the spirit of 'religious freedom'. It cannot be called an exposition of Unitarian belief or doctrine, for there is, strictly speaking, no such thing. Unitarian congregations 'do not require for themselves or their ministers subscription to any doctrinal articles of belief'. That indeed is the result of their claim for freedom. But freedom, in matters of belief, as in other spheres, is an ambiguous term. At one time it would have been fair to say that the Unitarian claimed freedom from adherence to the various doctrinal *formulae* of the Christian Churches, however much he might be in sympathy with the truths that lay behind them. In these pages emphasis is rather laid on freedom to follow the demands of 'modern' thought, and especially to sit lightly to the doctrines of the Divinity and the Atonement of Christ. It might perhaps be ungracious to say that the Christian faith is emasculated when God is represented as the 'conservator of values'; when man is said to be 'progressively discarnating himself and becoming godlike'; when we cannot be sure of 'belief in the eternal conservation of human personalities'; and when we have to recognize incarnation as a 'possibility in all ages and in all human souls'. But a faith which is forced into such a rarified and attenuated atmosphere is, we cannot but feel, living on its capital, as the phrase goes. While the writers claim for the members of the churches they represent the name of Christian, we are not surprised to learn that 'Christianity as a whole is deeply committed to outworn modes of thought', and is 'unfitted to cope in an enlightened way with present and future problems'.

The book is not free from the drawbacks of composite authorship. A good deal would seem to be claimed for Christ on some pages that is denied Him on others. And the cumbrous style favoured by most of the writers recalls an argument recently put forward in support of basic English, that it forces its writers to avoid long ambiguous words and to cut down the jungles through which so often the meaning wanders uncertainly and is lost. It would be unjust to overlook or to discount the strenuous, adventurous and, within its limits, reverent thinking in these chapters; but it would seem that the authors have never appreciated what is central in the New Testament — that our sins are forgiven and we are accepted with God through the Lord Jesus. They do not criticize the statement as a dogma of the theologians — who have to bear a heavy responsibility in these pages — only because it does not occur to them to mention it. But it is the pivot on which the whole Christian gospel turns.

W. F. LOFTHOUSE

*Isaiah Chapters xl-lv: Literary Criticism and History.* By Sidney Smith. (Milford, 10s. 6d.)

The Schweich lectures comprised in this volume are three in number: (1) Recent Criticism of Isaiah Chapters xl-lv, (2) History of the Years 556-539 B.C., (3) Some Unrecognized Historical Material in Isaiah, Chapters xl-lv. They are supplemented by voluminous Notes and Bibliographical References, and finally by a Chronological Arrangement and Analysis of these Prophecies. Nearly all scholars are agreed that Isaiah xl-lv consists of prophetical utterances delivered between 547 and 538 B.C. The interpretation of these utterances is difficult, not only because their author is unknown, but also because, in the circumstances of the time, any references to current events had to be oblique. While Dr. Smith does not draw the comparison — for his lectures were delivered early in 1941 — the Second Isaiah, with his enthusiasm for Cyrus, was very much in the position of a leader of an underground movement in the as yet unbroken Babylonian Empire. Dr. Smith agrees in the main with the broad conclusions of recent literary criticism. The chapters are not a 'book' but a collection of prophetic utterances, logically independent, of varying lengths but mostly short, and in no proven chronological order. We are therefore obliged to fit each section, as best we can, into the contemporary historical situation. The course

of events during the closing years of Babylonian dominion was early obscured. Much of that obscurity has been lifted in recent years, and on the history of the years 556-539 B.C. Dr. Smith speaks with perhaps unrivalled authority. It is when he comes to deal with 'some unrecognized historical material' in Deutero-Isaiah that most of his readers will rub their eyes. He is, to say the least, critical of the 'eschatological' interpretation of the prophecy so stressed by Volz (1932) and Begrich (1938, *not* 1936, page 79). Nor does he think of the rôle which the Jews played in the unfolding drama as a passive one, waiting for supernatural agents to prepare a way for their home-coming to Palestine with God as their Leader. We are to take it from xlvi. 10-13 that 'the true followers of the God of Israel are attacking the common enemy' (p. 61), and that '*YHWH, and therefore his people* (italics mine), are engaged in war. Men listening to these words in 540, or earlier, would think, not of a symbolic war, but of the real war in progress' (p. 62). The 'hand of YHWH' (xl. 2) is 'His agent Babylon' (p. 65), and the verses that follow are 'a proclamation ordering revolt' (p. 67). Again, 'The proclaimer, whoever he may have been, was commanding Palestinian peasants to aid the enemy of their overlord' (p. 66). The task committed to Israelites in xli. 14-16 is 'to work on mountain-tops and hill-sides so that they permit the passage of troops' (p. 69). What part did the Prophet himself play in these stirring events? Dr. Smith holds that it was he who called Israel to revolt in favour of Cyrus, and that he is the 'Servant' of xlix. 1-6, of l. 4-10, and also, 'most probably', of lii. 13-liii. 12. He was put to death by his compatriots because he outraged them by proclaiming that Cyrus was the promised Messiah. The 'Servant' of xlvi. 1-4 and 5-9, on the other hand, is Cyrus.

The Schweich Lectures are meant to deal with Biblical Archaeology, and Dr. Smith has attempted, very literally, to bring archaeology to the interpretation of Deutero-Isaiah. To what extent he has succeeded exegetes will have finally to decide. Meanwhile, however oblique the prophet's allusions to contemporary happenings may necessarily have been, it is not obvious anywhere in the prophecy that the Jews were ordered to act as armed partisans after the manner of the French *maquis*. It only remains to quote two passages from Dr. Smith — one from the Preface: 'Even should some of the interpretations suggested in the third lecture be thought unproven, the general principle may be worth further examination'; and the other from the Epilogue: 'This attempt to find in these passages direct references to contemporary events in no way excludes the deeper meanings that attach to them.'

C. R. NORTH

*Study Notes on Bible Books: Notes on the Hebrew Text of Job i-vi; Notes on the Hebrew Text of Jeremiah, chaps. iii, vii and xxxi; The Book of Job.* By Norman H. Snaith. (Epworth Press, 2s. 6d. each.)

Mr. Snaith has done more for such students as Methodist ministers on probation in the last few years than most people are aware. In two of these three succinct studies he has earned the further gratitude of all younger students of Hebrew. It often happens either that there is no English commentary on the texts prescribed for various examinations, or that it is bulky and expensive. The *Notes on Jeremiah* are intended to help those studying for the London Intermediate B.D. Why a University should set for external candidates in the elementary grade texts on which there is no commentary except in German it is hard to understand, but so it is, and all such students will call Mr. Snaith blessed. The notes, by the way, take account of the Greek and Latin versions. The volume on *The Hebrew Text of Job* makes frequent reference to 'WL'; this is presumably the *Hebrew Grammar* of Wood and Lanchester. These two small volumes help to meet a long clamant need. The

third volume contains notes on the whole of Job suitable for all beginners. There are a few slips; for example, in *The Book of Job*, p. 17, Azrael should surely be Azazel.

G. R. N.

*The Thought of St. James.* By A. T. Cadoux. (James Clarke, 3s. 6d.)

Dr. Cadoux believes that the Epistle of James was written by James of Jerusalem, as an authoritative letter for the Jewish pilgrims who had come up to Jerusalem for one of the festivals, that they might take it back with them for their brethren of the Dispersion. James, the brother of the Lord, had greater authority than Peter, and wrote this letter before the complete separation of Christianity from Judaism. The objections to his authorship — the good Greek, Stoic thought, the use of the Septuagint — are frankly faced by Dr. Cadoux, if not completely answered. He reiterates the other arguments for the early date, pointing out that the absence of reference to the Gentile controversy does not fix the date, since this was irrelevant to the author's purpose. James may well have heard of Paul's teaching of justification by faith without having read Romans, and his point is one with which Paul would agree that 'creed must not be exalted at the expense of conduct'. The Epistle is earlier than 1 Peter. The latter superseded it 'transforming the covert apology of James into explicit exposition of Christian doctrine, and addressing itself especially to the needs of Gentle converts'. The Epistle of James 'resembles the parables of Jesus in its method. It puts no pressure; it sets forth its truth in subtle suggestion, asks "What think Ye?", and leaves the answer to the reader'. Dr. Cadoux supports the suggestions, which other scholars have made, that the absence of reference to the death and resurrection of Jesus and to the Holy Spirit, and the omission of the doctrines of incarnation and atonement, are due to the author's deliberate intention to attract Jews to consider Jesus, and to avoid those affirmations which would arouse objections at the outset. He claims that, while the thought of the New Testament is almost entirely Pauline or Johannine, here is a book which shows how 'Christian doctrine was developed by the Jewish thought most akin to the thought of Jesus'. 'For non-dogmatic eyes', he says, 'the thought of St. James is more likely to be helpful than the Pauline or Johannine theology.' Dr. Cadoux writes, as in his other books, lucidly and persuasively, even if he may not carry all his readers with him all the way. But even when going over well-trodden ground he is refreshing and shows independence in judgement. His book, though small, is a stimulating exposition of an epistle which has been too often neglected as of little importance.

F. B. CLOGG

*Heart and Mind.* By Sydney G. Dimond. (Epworth Press, 12s. 6d.)

Dr. Dimond has already enriched our knowledge of religion by two studies of the *psychology* of the Evangelical experience. These have come to be regarded as authoritative. But there has long been a lack of a *philosophical* treatment of this experience. Dr. Dimond's book meets the need. With it among others the reproach that Methodism does not produce philosophers or theologians is in a fair way to be corrected. Dr. Dimond's method is to proceed, in the modern scientific manner, from an empirical and descriptive account of the psychological facts to tentative generalizations, with due allowance for the results already achieved in the relevant philosophical spheres of study. He finds that evangelical experience not only agrees with the best psychological science of our time, but contributes to and enriches it. Topics such as Salvation, Conversion, Sin, Repentance, Forgiveness, are dealt with both learnedly and critically. The writer claims that they belong to the main stream of Christian history — that they broaden out to embrace much in general religious tradition — and that they begin to appear as central in all religious developments.

Whether the last claim can be sustained is very questionable, but it is certain that Dr. Dimond, in casting his net so wide, has caught some notable fish for his evangelical fare.

His psychological analysis done, Dr. Dimond considers its philosophical bearings. In particular the idea of Perfection, so prominent in evangelical and Methodist thought, calls out for discussion, and it is shown that this ideal both differs from and completes the accounts given by other schools of thought. It involves respect for individuality — and so far Individualism is justified — but it widens into Community, both 'sacred' and 'secular'. And it is crowned by Imagination and Joy in the form of Beauty. The place of Art in religion is shown to be vital, though it is said that, curiously enough, the great spiritual teachers have always been conspicuously silent on the subject of art. Yet a comparison between Blake and Wesley is drawn, in a manner which will be found recondite by the unenlightened in symbolism. There remains the metaphysical question: is this aspiration after Christian Perfection justified at the bar of truth and reality? Now Perfection has to do with values, and a right theory of valuation is important for theology and philosophy. Dr. Dimond argues forcibly for the objective reality of our great values — notably the classical triad, Truth, Beauty and Righteousness. With adequate knowledge he shows them to be rooted and grounded in Reality, which he finds ultimately in personality, and especially in that incarnate Person who is the object of Christian faith. So evangelical experience is reconciled both with modern psychology and modern philosophy.

Whilst these studies, as they are modestly called, do not amount to a system, they certainly suggest one, which might contain answers to the many questions provoked by the present enquiry. For though the book is written for the most part in untechnical language, it does not follow that the problems raised are simple, nor the answers easy. However, Dr. Dimond has certainly done his best for the wayfaring man. One may only question whether he has not, in his zeal for evangelicalism, underrated the importance of that patient educational and social tradition in religion which may be called interpretative, rather than revivalistic. But there is no doubt that Dr. Dimond has vindicated the claim of Evangelicalism to be treated seriously in religious philosophy. His wide range of knowledge, his ability to extract pertinent material from almost any book, his catholicity of mind along with his adherence to his main thesis, have all served him well.

ATKINSON LEE

*Humanism and Christianity.* By W. S. Urquhart. (T. & T. Clark, 11s.)

The object of this important and timely book is to develop the thought that the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ ought to be the guiding principle of every action of our lives, and that it provides the only world-view which is religiously and philosophically satisfying — that the Incarnation is the key not only to traditional theological doctrine but to actual present-day philosophical construction. With this purpose Dr. Urquhart examines the present tension in thought. He shows how the nineteenth century saw the human spirit imprisoned within a world of knowledge limited to mathematical and physical categories, for which Kant was largely responsible. The end of this process is the despair of Bertrand Russell. Is it possible to escape through psychology? With thorough knowledge of the relevant authorities Dr. Urquhart shows that psychology by itself can offer no solution of the problem, but that it points, even in 'wishful thinking', to a reality which is the background of all our thinking. In the third chapter and also in the last Dr. Urquhart gives humanism its due as a serious attempt to provide a philosophy of life, but his criticism is that it disregards, theoretically at least, all the limits of human achievement, and by denying God has defeated its own end. An examination of naturalistic religion leads to a

comparison of this with the Dionysiac spirit in early Greece, and thence to a discussion of naturalism and idealism in Indian thought and religion. Four chapters are devoted to a radical criticism of the Barthian attitude to the religious problem, in which the writer finds an almost mechanical doctrine of the presence of the Holy Spirit. Barth's frigid attitude to non-Christian religions is a consequence of his doctrine that there is little or no natural capacity in the human soul for the reception of the Christian revelation. On the other hand, Barth was attacking the paganism of modern Europe and the religions of race, blood and soil, and these he knew by bitter experience were hostile to Christianity.

Having examined these trends in modern thinking, Dr. Urquhart gathers up the argument which is implicit in the whole book. The failure of humanism ought to drive it back upon its inherent possibilities, which can become actual only if they are linked with a recognition of the Divine in the human. Regarded not as a theological dogma but as a theoretical and practical principle of interpretation, redemption through the Incarnation throws light upon the character of the world in which it happens. The world admits of the remaking of man, and Christ transforms this possibility into reality. Man has wandered far from God, but he may still look upon the face of God and live, through the mercy of God in Christ. To this conclusion we are led by Dr. Urquhart along the road of disciplined thinking and in the company of many of the most significant writers of this generation. This book is a notable contribution to a Christian philosophy.

S. G. DIMOND

*Science and the Idea of God.* By W. Ernest Hocking. (Univ. of North Carolina, via Milford, 9s. 6d.)

Readers of Prof. W. E. Hocking's *The Meaning of God in Human Experience* will welcome his new book. He begins by referring to the oft-noted lull in the conflict between Science and Religion, each tolerating the other 'in its own sphere', since religion deals with the whole as a realm of value rather than of fact. Such division of territory leaves religion master in the field of ends but free to welcome the growing penetration of science into the problems of life, mind and reason. This 'solution' leaves our author profoundly dissatisfied; how long will it be (indeed, there is clear evidence already of the process) before Science claims to guide in the realm of values also? Religion cannot surrender its conviction that God is active in human affairs. Prof. Hocking therefore conducts the experiment of 'trying to get along without God and see what happens'. In psychology 'the Cure of Souls' has abundantly proved man's need for an objective faith (as witness Jung's admission). 'The whole issue of psychiatry, and of psychology on which it is founded, rests on objectives which lie beyond the mental states'. In sociology the religious dualism which humanism has tried to escape is revealed again in a masterly analysis of the values which humanism posits whenever it offers itself as a substitute for religious faith. 'The death of God leaves Society in the place of the Absolute; and like many another potentate who falls short of omniscience as well as omnipotence, we realize that his (Society's) pretensions are tolerable only when he is humble and recognizes a law above him'. From astro-physics, the realm from which God was dismissed in the seventeenth century reconstruction of scientific method, and from the concept of law, the abstraction of which has fettered religious thought for so long, we are made to face again the question of ultimate meaning. 'Only an irregular world can support a *history*.' The times are again ripe for the use of the much-abused term 'unique' to describe cosmic history. 'Why does this particular, unique pattern, Our Universe, exist?' — this question, in which physics renounces all interest but which is so fateful for religion, cannot remain for ever unanswered.

T. J. FOINETTE

*World Church.* By John Foster. (S.C.M., 6s.)

This little book contains an original and arresting summary of Church history by a historian who is also a missionary, and to whom the expansion of Christianity in the Far East is an essential and independent element in the whole story. Despite its oriental origins we in the West are accustomed to think of Christianity as somehow localized here, and we think of other parts of the world as 'the Mission Field'. Professor Foster will have none of this, and he shows us that almost from the earliest days Christianity went east as well as west, and in India and China it had had a long and honourable history before the nineteenth century. It is fascinating to read that the great Kublai Khan had a Christian mother, and that this may have been the basis of the legend of 'Prester John'. Mr. Foster writes, as he speaks, with great gusto, and he gives the lie to the view that Church History is necessarily a dull subject. Perhaps at times he gets carried by his enthusiasm almost into the belief that the conversion of a ruler is equivalent to the triumph of Christianity. The word 'Christianity' clearly needs some definition, for, in a sense, the history of the Church in the west has shown how harmful this political method of expansion has been, and how long in the agony involved in getting rid of the evil inherent in it. Professor Foster, however, does not fall into the mistake that was only too common after the Edinburgh Missionary Conference of 1910, when we emphasized the 'peculiar contribution' that the younger Churches had to give. This led, for instance, in Japan to an exaltation of the nationalist traits of Japanese Christianity over the universal appeal of the Gospel. This is a stimulating book not only for the theological student but for everybody.

A. V. MURRAY

*Pacifism and Conscientious Objection.* By G. C. Field. (Cambridge University Press. 3s. 6d.)

This little volume is unique. Its author, who is Professor of Philosophy in the University of Bristol, served for four years as a member of one of the Local Tribunals before whom some thousands of men who had registered as conscientious objectors appeared. The business of these Tribunals, operating under the Ministry of Labour, was to assess the genuineness of a man's objection to military service — to decide whether in point of fact it was a *conscientious* objection, and if that were established, to grant him exemption with or without conditions. At the close of his share in this responsible and difficult task Professor Field set on record his conclusions on pacifism and on the various types of conscientious objectors — religious, political, humanitarian. The author's position, as against the pacifist, is 'that there are certain evils which are worse than war, and that there are circumstances in which these can only be met by fighting'. Yet throughout the treatise there is manifest respect for the pacifist who took his stand sincerely on religious faith and teaching and who was ready to serve society constructively or to serve sufferers from the effects of war or misfortune. For the non-pacifist there is the reminder that 'When he has rejected the simple solution of the pacifist, he is only at the beginning of his own problems'. 'Pacifism as a policy' in public affairs is examined and the verdict of the author is definitely unfavourable. The discussion of 'Pacifism as an individual duty' concludes with this finding on religious conscientious objectors: 'Their fundamental assumption, that what Christ and St. Paul laid down for the conduct of the first believers must necessarily have been intended by them to hold for believers in later ages and in very different circumstances, is just what is open to question.' Obviously, on such a basis much more than Pacifism is open to debate and disregard. The chapter on 'Alternative Service' admirably states the position which most religious objectors to military service have affirmed or readily accepted.

HENRY CARTER

*The Price of Peace.* By Sir William Beveridge. (Pilot Press, 5s.)

Sir William Beveridge is irrepressible. So sincerely anxious is he to make his contribution to the new and better world that one hesitates to say that his latest book does not take us very far along the road to that permanent peace which he, and all sane men, so much desire. There is much in the book that is admirable — that goes without saying: but there are fallacies. One of his main fallacies is his under-estimation of the economic causes of war. To Sir William, who finds six main causes of modern war, the economic cause is not a major one; in fact he describes such a view as baseless. He does not deny that economic conditions make a real contribution to the stirring up of strife, but he regards such causes as indirect rather than direct. Sir William finds the most potent cause of war to be Fear. We may ask: 'Fear of what?' and also 'What induced the Fear?' It is quite true, as he says, that the 'existence of economic grievances or inequalities between individual citizens does not prevent establishment of the rule of law among them. The Government of an ordered community does not delay to prohibit robbery, violence and law-breaking until it shall have abolished all grievances, and made all laws just', but when Sir William suggests that the same principle holds of international relationships, and that the first objective must be to establish machinery for settling differences between nations otherwise than by war, is he not asking for a harvest for which he has not sown, and expecting to reap peace from a tree which may have been planted in the soil of injustice? Jesus seems to have suggested that this is to expect the impossible. Again, while it is quite true that there are many political causes of unrest, we still hold that the major causes of war are the economic conditions which provide the soil whereon political movements grow. Do not political nationalism and economic nationalism go hand in hand? The reviewer believes that in all modern wars the economic has been the chief motive — notwithstanding the ugly throw-up of the Nazi gangsters who thought to batten personally on their nation's misery. Further, no country will be anxious to fall in with Sir William's dream of a Super-National Authority, under which compulsory arbitration would take the place of war, so long as patriotism is allowed to be the last refuge of the profiteer. Yet, all this notwithstanding, there is much in Sir William's book that is admirable. No student of International Affairs can afford to miss it. How Sir William loathes war! He paints it in lurid colours because he knows it to be hell. Yet we must ask him: 'What kind of a war would be waged by the "overwhelming force" whose use he would allow when compulsory arbitration had broken down? Would it not involve the same horrors? And might not such an international force as he envisages be liable to cause "new wars for old"?' If it is true, as Sir William holds, that the greatest interest of the common people of the world is peace, why not be ready to stake all on the common people, believing that 'A people's revolt against war is the only way to peace?'

PERCY S. CARDEN

*The Jew in Our Day.* By Waldo Frank. (Gollancz, 4s. 6d.)

It all depends, of course, what you mean by 'the Jew', and about this there is a very considerable diversity of opinion to-day even among Jews themselves. Are they a race or a nation or a cultural or religious group? It is almost a case of '*quot homines tot sententiae*'. Waldo Frank, the author of this small but very stimulating collection of essays, is one of those who believe that the problem of the Jew is fundamentally a religious problem. As an American Jewish writer, a novelist, historian and critic, he has felt impelled from time to time to set down his reflections on the nature and destiny of his own people. These reflections, dating from 1929 onwards, are now presented to us in a volume which I hope many Christians will read. The writer sees the Jew as the heir of a tradition from which, however much this or that indivi-

du  
ti  
m  
gr  
lo  
su  
er  
ma  
im  
bo  
Ch  
in  
a  
ha  
Fo  
on  
Wi  
Eng  
gro  
est  
mo  
and  
rat  
Car  
is t  
on  
res  
adm  
in t  
org  
wh  
Mu  
Ave  
str  
trou  
The  
dow  
faith  
vill  
pers  
one  
Math  
In  
the a  
6

dual Jew may desire it, he can never escape. For Frank this tradition, being essentially religious, starts 'from this knowledge: that life has meaning, and that every man, woman and nation can discover life's meaning — which is to win the world, under God, through justice, mercy and love, for the brotherhood of man'. This is a great, if not unfamiliar, idea, but for Frank it is an idea which has taken flesh in the long history of the Jewish people. 'A played out people,' he says, 'could hardly have survived fifteen centuries of Christian Europe and Mohammedan Africa. A degenerate people is weak and sterile, and the Jews have not only continued to live and make progress in their own religion but also to feed western civilization.' The implications of this conviction, not only for the Jew but also for his Christian neighbour, form the burden of all that Frank has written here. Its importance for the Christian may be inferred from the fact that Reinhold Niebuhr has contributed an introductory chapter which is something much more than a mere commendation of a friend's work. It is a serious examination of the writer's thesis, and to this Frank has replied in a postscript. These two essays alone merit the most careful attention. For my own part, I can't help feeling that Frank has the last word in more ways than one!

WILLIAM W. SIMPSON

*Witchcraft in England.* By Christina Hole. (Batsford, 21s.)

The writer of this volume has previously produced a couple of admirable books on *English Folklore* and *English Custom and Usage*, and therefore she has the right background for dealing with this particular subject. Her very readable book is an interesting survey of the whole field. It is not heavily documented and once or twice more evidence might have been quoted. The alleged relation between Catharism and witchcraft, for example, is very dubious, and we imagine that there has been rather too much reliance here upon the writings of Montagu Summers, who (like all Catholics) sees Catharism everywhere. Our main criticism of the book, however, is that it hardly does justice to Dr. Margaret Murray's brilliant thesis in her two books on *The Witch Cult in Western Europe* and *The God of the Witches* — the most remarkable researches into this fascinating subject that have ever been made. It is frankly admitted on p. 22 of this volume that Dr. Murray's theory accounts for many things in the history of witchcraft that are otherwise difficult to understand, such as the organized covens, the Esbats and Sabbats, the proselytizing efforts, and the astounding courage of those who were put to death. But it is questioned, on a later page, whether conscious and widespread paganism lasted as long in England as Dr. Murray believed. I have not the least doubt that it did, and the effort made at Avebury, as late as 1400 or so, to destroy some of the stones in the circle there is a striking proof of this. Why were those stones shattered or buried, with effort and trouble? No doubt because they were centres of worship for surviving paganism. The belief in witchcraft played a large part in the life of our ancestors, and it lasted down to well within the last century. I could quote actual examples of a positive faith in the existence of witches, and a real dread of their activities, in a Lincolnshire village within the last generation. Yet this book gives a piquant account of the persistence of this superstition in our own land throughout the centuries, and everyone who is interested in survivals in culture should read it.

HENRY BETT

*Methodism and the Common People of the Eighteenth Century.* By Robert F. Wearmouth. (The Epworth Press, 12s. 6d.)

In this book Dr. Wearmouth has told the poignant story of the tragic sufferings of the common people of the eighteenth century. He clearly shows that there was far

more social agitation than we had realized. He records the manifold disturbances from 1740 to the end of the century, and shows that they sprung from the economic distresses of the period. He reveals how brutal were the penal laws, how fierce was the punishment of the agitators, and how cruelly Trade Unionists were penalized. The common people fought and knew many defeats. They were — to use Dr. Wearmouth's words — 'costly defeats'. We have looked too exclusively to the end of the century for the beginnings of deep unrest amongst the working classes, and have not realized their many earlier fights for social reform. This book is a vindication of another way of reading the history of the period. Dr. Wearmouth shows us that beneath the seeming complacency of the workers in this century there was widespread agitation, which was cruelly suppressed, but which brought forth in the next century a harvest of reform. Here, as everywhere, 'the blood of the martyrs is the seed' — 'the lower classes in the eighteenth century, really longing in their hearts to emancipate themselves from distress, want, and famine, were repressed, beaten, and defeated by those who ought to have been their guides, philosophers, and friends'. They were, however, not friendless, for John Wesley and the Methodist Revival brought new hopes. Dr. Wearmouth says: 'Against the lack of sympathy for the depressed classes, the positive and impassioned concern of the Methodists was as noonday to midnight'. He realizes that John Wesley had not only a deep insight into the tragic lot of the poor, but that he also strove to raise them from the morass into which they had sunk. His evangelism was an evangelism with social demands. Dr. Wearmouth says: 'Perhaps the main conclusion to be drawn from a thorough historical survey of the period is that the Methodism of John Wesley proved itself to be the most powerful and active understanding friend the working classes had during the whole of the eighteenth century'. Dr. Wearmouth has again shown his great gifts as an investigator. No student of the eighteenth century can afford to miss his book. It is a mine of information. While it gives us a careful survey of the condition of the common people of the eighteenth century, it also challenges and inspires us to seek to serve our generation as fervently as Wesley and his followers served theirs.

W. BARDSLEY BRASH

*The Urban Impact on American Protestantism, 1865-1900.* By Aaron Ignatius Abell. (Harvard University Press, via Milford, 21s.)

For many years now we have had a series of Harvard Historical Studies which have greatly enlarged our knowledge of particular periods but could never have been made available in the ordinary course of commercial publishing. This is the fifty-fourth volume to be published from the income of the Paul Revere Frothingham Fund. Where is the English Mr. Frothingham?

The very title of the book shows that it has a very specialized interest, and even for its limited circle of readers it will be most useful as a book of reference. The work has many solid merits. A wealth of reading is behind it and the author has been careful to go to the proper sources. The bibliographical essay (so-called) carries its own commendation. There is a very full account not only of the social work of the various denominations, but of particular churches and church leaders. Prof. Abell summarizes the chief contribution of American Protestantism during his period under certain main headings. There was first of all the moving away from a passive alliance with the well-to-do middle classes, and a growing sympathy with the legitimate claims of the workers for shorter hours, better wages and improved conditions of industry. This carried with it a denunciation of the selfish individualism of contemporary economics and a plea for greater co-operation between management and workers. Then there was the growth of institutional Churches which in the author's words were 'object lessons in democracy and social justice'. More important

still were the non-sectarian missions and city missionary societies. To these must be added the Y.M.C.A., Y.W.C.A., the Salvation Army and other Christian bodies committed to social enterprise. Prof. Abell describes their activities in detail. He wisely recognizes that the social witness of Christian people is by no means confined to their own churches. He shows that in America, as in England, a high proportion of social workers of all kinds are Christian people. In 1905 the American Institute of Social Service found that three out of every four social workers were faithful church members. Yet Prof. Abell does not overstate his case. He acknowledges that at the end of the century the work of the churches only reached a relatively small part of the working class population, and he pleads for a 'more extensive social service, a keener sense of responsibility for the removal of industrial evils, and above all, a profoundly spiritual use of the agencies of social Christianity'. The book has its defects. There is no attempt to put the record of the churches against the larger background of American life and movements of thought. While there is a very full account of the actual work accomplished, there is only the most sketchy reference to the social thinking and literary propaganda of American Protestantism. Consequently no pattern emerges. We cannot see the wood for the trees. And was the Atlantic so wide that the vigorous sociological thought in England could not jump the ocean? Nevertheless, the book remains a valuable storehouse of facts for all those who desire to be more fully acquainted with this aspect of American history.

MALDWYN EDWARDS

*Fabian Colonial Essays*. Edited by Rita Henden. (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.)

The Fabian Colonial Bureau is a lusty child of the famous parent Society. Already it has rendered excellent service to colonial peoples, especially in Africa and the West Indies—for example, by that penetrating book *Plan for Africa*, recently written by Dr. Rita Henden, leader of the Bureau and editor of this volume of *Colonial Essays*. The team of contributors to it are fully as brilliant as the writers of the Fabian Tracts which made so great a stir a generation ago. Among them there are men who have given many years of service under Colonial Governments, as well as writers whose knowledge of Colonial life is based largely on reading and conference, and whose judgements, therefore, however sound may be their principles, are open to be dismissed by 'old-timers' of the Colonies as the impracticable meanderings of theorists. It is interesting to compare the two types of essay. All write under a compelling sense of urgency. Colonial development has trodden with laggard steps, and, at the rate of progress being achieved up to the period of the war, it looked as if the triumphant end in complete self-government, the goal of British policy so proudly proclaimed by successive Secretaries of State, would only be reached after more generations of supervision and careful tutelage. The times forbid any such slow advance. Apart from the legitimacy of the ambition of peoples to become entirely responsible for their own affairs, India has shown a warning light, as have certain events in the West Indies, of the danger of dilatoriness. The writers of those Essays whose experience is limited to occasional journeys at the most, are, in spite of their research, insufficiently aware, one feels, of the tremendous difficulties to be overcome in instituting the swift reforms they so powerfully advocate. Nor do they give quite enough credit to the changes and the speeding-up which have characterized recent activity in Colonial administration. References to the Mass Education proposals for all Africa are, for example, exceedingly slight. It is unfortunate also that the book was published before the development of plans for an administration in Nigeria closely parallel to some of the proposals which are argued so vigorously for it. Not so with the writers who have lived among the conditions calling for improvement. One, indeed, in an essay of two dozen pages, pricks bubble after bubble of theories

## RECENT LITERATURE

of short-cut reforms, jabbing his pin into some of them right up to the head. These have seen the problems from the inside, and, while no whit behind their fellow-essayists in the demand for swifter action, along socialist lines, are properly aware that blue-prints of progress are no guarantee of Utopia and that plural societies confound the issues. Yet the freshness, vigour and sincerity of this book of essays and the sound common sense of most of its suggestions should make it a handbook for all who are interested in the progress of the colonies.

F. W. DODDS

*Building Peace Out of War: Studies in International Reconstruction.* (P.E.P., Milford, 10s. 6d.)

P.E.P. is a research group on political and economic planning which publishes its reports anonymously. The present book expounds the principles of the Atlantic Charter in the concrete terms of modern problems, and it is the best and most practical 'guide to the Peace' that we have yet seen, even though it does not cover all the ground but confines itself to political and economic affairs. Throughout there is a reminder of a fact which the British people have always been unwilling to recognize—our changed position since Victorian days. Power rests to-day not on armies and navies nor on frontiers, but on 'industrial potential', but in this Russia and the United States are better off than we are. We are no longer the workshop of the world. The aeroplane has neutralized the English Channel. We can no longer keep aloof from European politics. For all nations must combine in world politics and isolationism is impossible. The old days of national sovereignty are gone, and statesmen are needed with a world outlook rather than a national one. We have all to help one another to practise this creed. On this basis the writers discuss Britain's relations to Europe, Russia and America, commodity control, air transport, and British foreign policy. There is an admirable chapter on colonies, containing some sensible comments on the need for capitalist enterprise in the development of backward peoples. The writers also warn us against thinking of freedom only in political terms—the great weakness of the League of Nations and of Liberalism everywhere. Self-government depends much more on 'the encouragement of sturdy, self-reliant local communities' than on some central representative institution—on axiom of wide application all round. Freedom from want is as important as freedom from fear, and to neglect it will prevent any real international security, for 'it will create a state of affairs to which the sole unifying factor among the victorious United Nations will be their common determination to hold down the vanquished'. This is a wise word. The function of the British Commonwealth in all this is to give an example of the working of free institutions. As an illustration of this we may note that the most important export of Britain during the war has been the principles of the Beveridge report—'Britain will retain her position in Europe just so long as the progressive forces and forward-looking people in Europe look to Britain for leadership (in this sense) and see Britain getting results'.

A. V. MURRAY

*The University and the Modern World.* By Arnold S. Nash. (S.C.M., 12s. 6d.)

This is one of the most important books published in our generation, despite its apparently limited scope. The university is really everybody's concern. From the university come the teachers in the secondary schools, from which in turn come the teachers in the elementary schools. From the university come the teachers in adult education, and research workers in science and industry. The universities, too, do a great deal for the training of the ministry. They have a far greater influence in the world than they appear to have; and the nature of university thinking affects all of

us. Mr. Nash sees cause for grave disquiet here, and he presents his thesis under three heads — first, the plight of the liberal democratic university which, he states, is due to the rise and decline of scientific individualism; second, 'the totalitarian university: a true diagnosis but a false remedy'; and third, 'towards reconstruction'. He deals with the fallacy that science is neutral because it has no presuppositions and is concerned only with facts. It is not difficult to show that a science without presuppositions cannot be a science at all. Even in the physical sciences there must be some principle of classification of material, and it is still more evident in the case of the social sciences. The idea that 'facts' can speak for themselves is nonsense; but this will-o'-the-wisp of 'objectivity' is ardently pursued by scientific economists, and easily results in a cold, impersonal, statistical handling of human material. An impersonal estimate of a person must always be untrue, no matter how scientifically it is presented, because it is at variance with its own subject-matter. Yet even modern psychology shows this vicious tendency to treat human factors altogether impersonally. The Fascists and Nazis challenged this method of impartiality and gave to the university a pattern and a purpose. While this showed a sense of realism, the remedy was worse than the disease, for the pattern chosen was a local one with no universal characteristics, and its purpose was a false one, namely, the self-glorification of one's own race. The only worthy aim is unity with freedom, and this we ought to find in the Christian scheme of the nature of things. But we must avoid all scholasticism, scientific, political and theological, and remember that truth is wider than any syllogism. Moreover, as Mr. Nash says, we must not 'confuse the spirit of the age with the spirit of the ages'. He is a chemist, an economist and a philosopher, and he was formerly a secretary of the S.C.M. He has therefore many qualifications for the writing of an authoritative study of the universities. It is a pity that his English style is so laboured, and that he greatly overdoes the use of quotations. But he has written a learned, well-documented and forceful book, which challenges modern thought on every page.

A. V. MURRAY

*George Hamilton Archibald.* By Ethel Archibald Johnston. (Religious Education Press, Wallington, Surrey, 5s.)

Westhill Training College, The Hayes, Kingsmead, Summer Schools, Easter Schools and Swanwick, are now such well-known institutions to most Sunday School workers that we are apt to forget the part played by Mr. George Hamilton Archibald and his family in pioneer crusading for their establishment. His life story is here told by his daughter, who joined her mother and father in the work of religious education amongst young people. This great 'Crusader for Christ', equipped with an experience which would appeal to any youthful adventurer — a knowledge of the great forests, of how to handle horses, and how to catch lobsters and seals — brought to this land 'New World' ideas from Canada, Nova Scotia, and Newfoundland. Impulsive and active by nature, George Archibald threw himself unreservedly into the work of practising and extending the theories of Froebel, Robert Raikes, Bishop White, and Horace Mann. We owe to him the spread of the graded school idea in England, for, co-operating with Free Church Leaders, he went on tour after tour, preaching his belief in it. Nor was this all. Mr. Stanley Sowton describes him as 'an outstanding figure in religious education. He knew children, and he knew human nature in the shape of Sunday School Teachers'. He unceasingly advocated reverence and orderliness in Sunday School worship, the training of young teachers, preparation classes, and the cultivation of atmosphere. He gave himself to the piloting of these developments through the reefs and shoals of the 'critical' movement of scholarship, to the reform of the lesson syllabus, the founding of Summer Schools

## RECENT LITERATURE

and Westhill Training College, and so on and on. The influence of this servant of God — traveller, a man of the world, teacher of the Spirit, pioneer in religious education, creator of character in young men and young women — is felt even in reading the story of his life, here so simply and admirably told. The profits from the sale of the book are being devoted to the improvement of Sunday School work in memory of one who loved that cause.

NORMAN GREENHALGH

*The Man India Loved.* Edited by John S. Hoyland. (Lutterworth Press, 4s. 6d.)

The two names inscribed on the gravestone of C. F. Andrews in Calcutta remind us that in India C.F.A. was taken to mean 'Christ's Faithful Apostle'. He was called 'Friend of the Poor' by Mr. Gandhi, who declared, 'Andrews means to me the highest I have known in the English. With Andrews I enjoyed a relationship closer than I have enjoyed with any Indian'. It is this man who is pictured in two dozen simply worded sketches in Mr. Hoyland's little book. The same pattern is repeated in almost every chapter. Some baffled man or woman faces a problem created by famine, pestilence, political pressure, factory conditions, the sorcerer or the land-jobber, and nearly always endless debt-slavery. All these pitiful people meet C.F.A., who in spite of his white face wins their confidence by his Indian dress, his patience, his friendliness and his pity. The help this gifted scholar brought to despairing folk was not in sermons or doles. He had early given away all his life-savings. He had influence after his wide travel and his chairmanship of the Indian Trades Union Congress, but best of all he gave distressed folk the vision of a better future through co-operative effort. From him came 'new ideas which would not lie down again and sleep till they made you *do something*'. A Muslim scholar said, 'I strove hard to get him to see that I was merely a very small pawn in the vast game which Fate was playing with India; but he cared nothing for Fate; what he cared for . . . was me. He had begun to love India for me, and to love India in me!'

This is not a critical biography. Some problems are over-simplified — for instance, the account of indentured Indian labour in Africa. All the witnesses through whose eyes we are invited to look at C.F.A. were friendly and appreciative, not to say infatuated. A hostess who found he always left the taps running or missionaries who worked in organized societies did not always find it easy to be pleased with this gentle free-lance, yet, as one writer says,

'We loved him for his humility, for his helplessness, for his trustfulness, for his pity towards the suffering poor, but above all we loved him for himself, for what he was, his 'Charlieness', as we called it. Gradually, as we got to know him and his ideals better, we found a better word for this quality . . . we began to call it Christlikeness, even those of us who were ardent Hindus or Mussulmans.'

G. STAINTON MARRIS

*My Father in China.* By James Burke. (Michael Joseph, 15s.)

This is a biography of an American missionary, William Burke, a Methodist minister, now interred in Shanghai, written by his son James. As a youth William Burke studied alongside Charlie Soong, father of Mesdames Sun Yat-Sen and Chiang Kai-Shek. We thus get new light on the members of this distinguished family. The author apparently draws upon his father's well-kept diaries, upon the stories his mother has told him, and upon the memories of his own boyhood in China. He has an immense admiration for his father, a thoroughly Chinese trait, and his father is not unworthy of such esteem. It is hard to keep the true perspective of a China residence of more than fifty years in a book of less than 300 pages. There

is a tendency to mass together the heights of the father's experiences until it seems like one vast towering table-land. The truer picture would consist of hill and dale, mountain and plain, with the humdrum plain predominating. Often the author's facts are not beyond challenge. His reflections, for instance, on Chiang Kai-Shek, whilst current in some quarters, are not likely to be verified in the light of history. When he speaks of the relationship of the missionary to pagan China there is too much about the weirdness of an alien people and too little about the positive values of one of the greatest civilizations the world has ever seen. The horrid word 'natives' is innocently scattered all over the book. Yet, when all is said this is a remarkable and attractive book and one of the best and truest pictures of a missionary to be found in print. The author, like his father, is frankly and avowedly a Methodist, and this is a most refreshing trait. Let us hope the book will be widely read, even though with a grain or two of salt. While the son writes of his father with appreciation and love, he perforce writes of China as a listener and outsider. What else could he do, being himself and not his father?

H. B. RATTENBURY

*William Penn, a Tercentenary Estimate.* By W. Wistar Comfort. (Oxford University Press, 12s.)

By a happy accident this book, originally published by the University of Pennsylvania, bears on its title page the names of three cities — London, Oxford and Philadelphia. Since it is an attempt, and a successful one, to assess the significance of the life of William Penn, there is undesigned aptness in the conjunction of his place of birth, his own University (though it sent him down, degreeless, after eighteen months of residence), and that most melodious of place names, Philadelphia, capital of the State which carries his name. Dr. Comfort is well qualified for his task, as he is the President of the Historical Association of the Society of Friends. Wisely, he draws freely on Penn's own words, for like so many of the seventeenth century giants, Penn was a voluminous writer, and by Dr. Comfort's judicious selection the reader is enabled to make his own 'estimate' of this Englishman who has left an indelible mark on American history. We are grateful to an author who, though he loves his theme, abstains from eulogy and succeeds in 175 pages in telling the story of a Friend whose career is exceptional and, indeed, unique. Little did the grim old Admiral Sir William Penn realize what would result from a chance invitation given to a travelling Quaker preacher, one Thomas Loe, to visit his home and declare his message there. Though William was then very young (he was thirteen) he yet observed what effect Thomas Loe's doctrine had on his hearers; so that a black of his father's could not contain himself from weeping aloud; and he, looking on his father, saw the tears running down his cheeks also. 'What', he thought, 'if they would all be Quakers?' Ten years were to pass before William Penn saw Thomas Loe again — ten years that were to turn him into an exquisite young Cavalier who had made the Grand Tour, learnt French, Dutch, and Italian, served under his father at sea, and shared in his greatest victory over the Dutch. Amidst the temptations of the Restoration Court the youth had kept his record clean, but his soul was unsatisfied. Then in 1667 the moment of his 'convincement' came, from which all that happened to him afterwards derived. Once more Thomas Loe crossed his pathway and as he developed the theme that 'there is a faith that overcomes the world, and there is a faith that is overcome by the world', his choice was made, and through all the long years that were to follow there was never a thought of turning back. This is a moving story, finely told, and though on his closing page Dr. Comfort withholds from Penn the word 'hero', those who have profited from his discriminating and helpful study may find in this one point their only difference from their guide.

WILFRID L. HANNAM

*A Very Present Help.* By Lieut.-General Sir William Dobbie. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 5s.)

The Defence of Malta is one of the epic stories of the war. It is generally admitted that the part played by General Dobbie in this defence was one of the chief causes of its success. This book contains a record both of his Malta days and of other events in his Army career which have impressed him with the conviction that they were the direct answer to prayer and evidence of the guidance of the Spirit of God. Cynics may smile and psychologists may give their explanations, but to those of us who have had similar experiences, though in less important spheres, the book will be a real inspiration and a re-enforcement of faith. Instances are recorded in the book of the critical days of 1918 in the last war, and during the disturbances in Palestine in 1929. The three chapters on 'The miracle of Malta' tell stories of such vivid interest as the arrival of the convoy in 1941 and the subsequent attack on H.M.S. *Illustrious*, and, in 1942, on H.M.S. *Penelope*. The appointment of General Dobbie to Malta before the declaration of war by Italy might well be emphasized. General Dobbie was one of the leading engineers of the British Army. Malta was to receive one of the heaviest aerial bombardments of the war. In two years, in an area no larger than the Isle of Wight, there were 2000 bombing attacks. There exist in Malta caves and tunnels which, under the direction of an able engineer, could be turned into the safest of shelters. Six weeks before the commencement of these bombardments, this outstanding engineer was appointed as Governor and Commander in Chief. Under his direction caves were turned into shelters and fitted to accommodate large numbers of the inhabitants. Many hundreds of lives must have been saved. No appointment could have been better suited for such critical days. This is a book both for those who believe in God's guidance and those who don't.

P. MIDDLETON BRUMWELL

*In Our Tongues.* Edited by J. Patrick Stevenson. (S.P.C.K., 5s.)

This book is a collection of addresses given to the Forces. It sets out — to use the terms of the foreword by the Lord Bishop of Norwich — to present 'a varied picture of the effort made to present a reasoned Christian Faith, and to show its relevance in the lives of ordinary men'. It consists of thirty-three addresses given by various persons under varied circumstances. A few of them are short sermons in the field; a few formed the substance of addresses at Padre's Hours; eight are broadcast addresses. Sixteen were given by serving chaplains. While there is much of value in the book, we have two small criticisms to make. First, too many addresses have been crowded into 128 pages. In consequence only one page is given to the contribution by Mr. C. S. Lewis on 'All and Nothing' and only two to the address on 'What is Christianity?' by the Bishop of Edinburgh. The same number is allotted to six other items, including an article by a signalman of the R.C. of S. on the suggestive subject 'If I were a Padre'. The reader is left with the feeling that such themes are treated all too briefly. Secondly, the subjects of the addresses have little relation to each other. No attempt is made to present a 'consecutive' statement on the Christian Faith. Nor can it be said that the addresses contain many new or striking ideas. The chief value of the book is the 'directness' of the application of the message to the lives of the hearers. Here some of the addresses succeed. But one is left with the desire, especially in these days when ignorance of the teaching of Christ is so profound, that the addresses had covered it more completely and in a more consecutive form. There is room still for a volume on this teaching by men of practical and outstanding experience.

P. M. B.

*The Friendship of Christ.* By the Rev. Canon Charles Smyth. (Longmans, 2s. 6d.)

The present Archbishop of Canterbury, while still Bishop of London, selected this book for reading during Lent. Its author is well known as Fellow and Dean of Chapel of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. The Lent of '45 has passed, but this 'devotional study' deserves far more than the ephemeral lot of so many Lenten books, for it is worthy of a place, not only on our shelves, but in our hearts and minds as well. The 'one thing needful' for our distracted world, for the perplexed, divided Church, and for each one of us, is the Friendship of Christ. The book is the fruit of the author's own experience as well as of his knowledge as a historian and a scholar. The writer's teaching is not merely emotional; it tells also of the objective reality of Christ's friendship for us, of its nature and implications, and of the methods by which we may respond to it and continually increase our own experience of its all-sufficiency. While it is hardly to be expected that every reader will be able to follow every detail in this book, we are grateful to Canon Smyth for having written it and we commend it to all who are seeking to know more of the treasure hidden in the field of human life in these bewildering days.

THOMAS H. BARRATT

*To My Son.* By Guy H. King. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 5s.)

The title of this book is at first misleading. The 'father' is the apostle Paul, and the 'dearly beloved son' is Timothy. The book is an exposition of the Second Epistle to Timothy and contains eighteen Bible readings delivered in a Bible school. They contain a great variety of suggestive comments and illustrations, and they will be found of value, not only to many preachers, but also to those who take classes for young people in Sunday Schools or elsewhere, and indeed to all who desire to understand more clearly the message of Paul in this Epistle.

T. H. B.

*Stories of the Boy Jesus.* By Mary Entwistle. (Religious Education Press, 5s.)

The New Testament is comparatively silent about the boyhood of Jesus, but the Hidden Years offer a field of imaginative study which may for the nursery child provide a background to more advanced study later. This book contains a series of lessons based on the fact that the boyhood of Jesus was natural and spent in a typical Jewish home. The modern study of village life in the unchanging East provides a wealth of material to the painstaking teacher and parent. If such matter is used as the capable author intends, then the very young will have a very good introduction to the life of Christ. This series of talks is in harmony with the purpose of the agreed syllabuses and is well illustrated by line drawings which make a vivid appeal. Suitable activities in various directions are suggested. This book meets a need.

J. H. M.

*The Arbitration: The Epitrepontes of Menander.* Translated and Completed by Gilbert Murray. (Allen & Unwin, 5s.)

Menander is the source of unnumbered quotations. The familiar instance in 1st Corinthians, chap. xv, was, one surmises, drawn from a common stock and need not imply Paul's direct acquaintance with the Thais, from which it comes. This only makes it the more significant, for to be so prodigally quotable — like Shakespeare — implies both a great felicity of phrase and word and a high talent for dealing with character. This makes it the more tantalizing that only fragments of Menander's original texts are preserved. Little more than half the present play exists, to which conjecture has added one speech from a fragment entitled *Euripides* but clearly not his. In the additions, says Prof. Murray, 'I have tried to observe the Menandrian

conventions, and as far as I can hope to understand it, the Menandrian spirit'. The plot had to be completed, too, in large measure, and this gives opportunity for Prof. Murray's insight not only into the conventions but into the underlying ideas of the New Comedy as a whole. The happy ending comes full circle; it is spring after winter, life after death. Prof. Murray had already tried his hand with *Perikeiromene*, 'The Rape of the Lock'. This has been successfully acted in his version. *Epitrepontes* is a more difficult venture — the plot is more intricate, the character-drawing richer, and the element of farce a great deal less. It is a maturer work. Whether it would act in its reconstructed form remains to be seen, but it reads delightfully. The contrasted types of character form a gallery of real people, the whole forming a setting for the finest of them all, the slave-girl Babrotonon. In reprinting the name of Carion should be inserted on page 18, after the third line, as speaker.

W. G. FINDLAY

*Norway in World History*. By Wilhelm Keilhau. (Macdonald, 5s.)

In the 'Cross-Roads' series Dr. Wilhelm Keilhau, jurist, economist and historian, has written of Norway in World History. The viewpoint is that of the university professor but the style is that of the man of affairs who is used to stating his case with conviction and clarity. The Norwegian civilization has a history of two thousand years in which the fisherman, the hunter, the farmer and the iron worker have played their part. The artist and the poet were fostered and religion developed with poetry. The statesmanship of this hardy race began in the ninth century and developed into an 'extreme liberalistic democracy' in which the laws were the common resolutions of free men. The growth of internal order was matched by the external aggression of the Vikings who dominated the East Atlantic coast for centuries, and the adventurous spirit that discovered America. The Norwegian Empire expanded till the energies of the Hanseatic League and the ravages of the Black Death ushered in a period of decay which lasted for five centuries. The renaissance of Norway came just over one hundred years ago. The outbreak of the First World War found the Norwegians with a first-class mercantile fleet which suffered much from the Germans. The Nordic spirit of progress and persistence made a fine recovery till with the advent of the present war the land was overrun and her fleet imperilled. The summary given of Norway's hopes in the New Order is a real contribution to international understanding which every student of world affairs will do well to read.

J. HENRY MARTIN

#### PLAYS

It was the Church that taught the English people how to use the drama. To-day it is learning again its own lesson. The beginnings are modest but effective. The Epworth Press has added five more to its excellent series of Bible Plays — *The Exaltation of Capernaum*, by J. E. Eagles (1s.); *Ruth and Naomi*, by Leon R. Jones (6d.); *Gold and Frankincense and Myrrh*, by Maud H. Reed (1s.); *Unto Us*, by Hilda M. Harrison (6d.); and *Not Without Honour*, by L. Scadeng Cheshire (1s. 6d.). The first is 'a play for ten women'. Two of the others are nativity plays. In the last, which is 'an exposition of the Passion', the writer has dared to use blank verse as well as prose. Our playwrights are learning to show us Jesus though He never appears. . . . The Religious Education Press (Wallington, Surrey), which is never content with the 'second best,' issues a booklet called *The Bible as Drama* (1s. 6d.). It is written by Evelyn A. Downs, and, in addition to 'hints on producing', bibliography, etc., there are four plays; on Bethlehem (Ruth, David, Jesus), Joseph, Daniel, and Jonah. These can also be bought separately at fourpence each.

*From My New Shelf*

BY C. RYDER SMITH

*The Way of At-one-ment.* By W. H. Phythian-Adams. (S.C.M., 7s. 6d.)

This is another book about Re-union, but, as one would expect, Canon Phythian-Adams approaches it in his own way. His book may be studied from three points of view. First, it is a study in Biblical Theology as the author sees it. The ruling idea is that the Church is Israel, and not merely *like* Israel. Here the writer coins the word 'homology' as over against 'analogy'. Under it he shows how three concepts — Redemption, Covenant, and Inheritance — run through the Bible, and how in the New Testament there is nothing more than the completion (and correction) of the same ideas in the Old. He then devotes a chapter to 'The Royal Priesthood' of the whole People of God, examining particularly the Priestly Code. He says little about sin here, for he thinks it an individual phenomenon, but emphasizes the idea that the sacrifice of this priesthood is a *people's* sacrifice or offering of itself to God. For this its members must be at-one with each other. He has little evidence to offer that this priesthood is conceived as 'royal' in the Old Testament. When he pursues the idea into the New Testament, he finds it necessary to dismiss Paul's account of 'the law' as a Rabbinic aberration. He has a number of interpretations of particular texts that are disputable. For instance, he claims that Christ and His church are 'one flesh' because Paul says that a man and his wife are 'one flesh' (*Ephesians v 25 ff.*). Surely 'flesh' means different things in the two phrases. But there is little fault to find with the writer's main contentions — that the whole Church is a priesthood and that its one offering is the offering of itself to God. Throughout his book Dr. Phythian-Adams has nothing to say for sacerdotalism. He holds that in its first few generations the Church was true to the Biblical concept, but that then it went astray, using, for instance, the Old Testament distinction between the High Priest, the Priest and the Levite as though it were homologous with the Christian Ministry. He thinks that sacerdotalism crept in from the Christian demand for a way of escape from post-baptismal sin. He thinks, therefore, that at the time of the Reformation the Church, spite all appearances, had long been too individualistic, and that the Reformers repeated the error in their own way when they insisted so much on individual salvation. There is no room to discuss whether here they did injustice to the New Testament. Dr. Phythian-Adams' insistence is upon the unity both of local churches and of the whole Church. For him the primary duty of a Minister is to be a pastor (he hardly mentions evangelism), that is, to practise at-one-ment among his people. For his account of the practice of the early Church our author leans much on the *Didascalia*, dismissing the *Didache* very summarily. But apart from detail, Free Churchmen will find little quarrel within what he says so far, though they may want to supplement it.

The situation is very different when we turn, secondly, to the author's practical proposals for re-union. He himself says naively that he has 'no personal knowledge of the Friends' tenets', and it looks as if the same were true of the tenets of the other Free Churches too. Any reader who does know them will marvel at the sheer simplicity of the Canon's proposals. There is no space for a detailed examination, but an example ought to be given. The writer suggests that every local church should have a pastor who should always have the last and decisive word, and that local churches should form larger groups with similar 'leaders'. From this we pass to larger groups still, until we reach the whole Church on earth, the principle of benevolent but authoritarian leadership running throughout. Canon Phythian-Adams quotes Clement of Rome's comparison of the Church with the Roman army, but he

seems unaware that the Salvation Army practises his proposals. Is it right at this point?

But there is a third way of considering this book. Its temper is always right and its purposes spiritual. Throughout his book Canon Phythian-Adams urges that the love of God and man is the 'one thing needful'. Happily there is growing agreement that at least it is the first thing needful. Here the writer practises what he preaches all the more effectively because he has no need to say so.

*The Missionary Message of the Old Testament.* By H. H. Rowley. (Carey Press, 5s.)

The great missionary book of the Old Testament is Deutero-Isaiah and Professor Rowley rightly gives the whole of the third of these four lectures to a careful exposition of its teaching. He agrees with the late Dr. Wheeler Robinson in the view that 'the Servant' may refer sometimes to a community and sometimes to an individual. Mr. Sidney Smith's recently published Schweich Lectures seem to show that Nabonidus was no mere archaeologist, as Professor Rowley suggests. Readers will note that most of the passages discussed in the second lecture are of later date than Deutero-Isaiah. Professor Rowley deals with them first because they do not reach the heights of the Prophet of the Exile. In this lecture he draws largely on the Psalms. One might have expected a reference to Isaiah xix. 23 ff. In the fourth lecture the chief subjects are the testimony of Jonah, the particularism of the period — justifiable in temporary practice but not as permanent principle — and the way in which the Christian Church took up the task that Israel declined. In these three lectures Professor Rowley successfully sets himself to hand on to the general reader the broadly agreed results of the experts. It is different with the first lecture, which deals with Moses. Professor Rowley does justice to the man who made the oldest people in the world. It is a happy idea to present him as the first missionary — a missionary, like Francis and Wesley, to his own people. Not all the experts will agree with everything in Professor Rowley's account. For him Moses was the apostle of the god of the Kenites to such of the Hebrews as had gone down into Egypt — a god already of righteousness and mercy. This means that Moses' message was a message of salvation from a strange god. It is at any rate an idea well worth pondering, and Professor Rowley, of course, has reasons for it. One may add that he accepts the universal reference of God's words to Abraham, 'In thee and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth bless themselves'. May this not have originally meant 'In thee and in thy seed (i.e. Isaac and Jacob) shall all the nations of the land bless themselves'? In any case history has vindicated the world-wide interpretation.

*The Hymns of Methodism.* By Henry Bett. (Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.)

When the first edition of this book appeared in 1913 it at once took its place as the book about the Wesleys' hymns considered as literature. There was a second 'enlarged' edition in 1920, and now we have the fruits of a quarter of a century's further study. '*Con amore*' might be written across every page. This edition is 'revised, recast and greatly enlarged'. Perhaps the most interesting enlargement falls under Dr. Bett's canons for distinguishing John Wesley's hymns from his brother's. To the earlier six (or eight) canons Dr. Bett now adds seven (or eight) more. Dr. Bett would now assign the following hymns to John in addition to those on his earlier list: 'And can it be?' 'How do thy mercies', 'Father, whose everlasting love', 'Leader of faithful souls', 'Thee will I praise', 'My heart is full of Christ', and 'When Israel out of Egypt'. If he is right about the first, it seems to mean that both brothers wrote hymns at the Pentecost of 1738 — and that John wrote the finer. One can only wonder again at the easy erudition of the book as a whole. Anyone could 'spot' such things as Horace's '*Justum et tenacem*', or Augustine's 'Our heart is restless', or Milton's 'Dark, dark,

dark' — but what of such writers as St. Cosmas or Des Barreaux or John Austin? Or what of the labour implied in the modest sentence, 'I think Pope never uses "convert" in a rhyme'? Others may perhaps still glean an ear or two in this literary field, but Dr. Bett has reaped the harvest.

*The Problem of Population*, By Gyan Chand; *Tariffs and Industry*. By John Matthai. (Oxford University Press, 9d. each.)

In the series of 'Oxford Pamphlets on Indian Affairs' a successful attempt is being made to answer the urgent question 'What do the abler of Indians think?' The pamphlets are all the more illuminating because they are primarily addressed to Indians. These two numbers are good examples. They have certain common characteristics. Both writers are critical of Britain, yet both write in English; both expect that before long India will be governing itself; both know that self-government *per se* will work no miracles; the first advocates the practice in India of the Western doctrine of birth-control, and the second the application of Western economic doctrine to India's needs; both base their discussions on well-authenticated facts and urge well-weighed policies. One may add that both were printed at the Wesley Press in Mysore City. Dr. Chand's pamphlet, hoping against hope, prescribes a desperate remedy for a desperate disease. Dr. Matthai faces a less difficult problem. He claims that a regulated tariff, to be varied at need, will best further the industrialization of India, but says little to show how this will help her in 'economic co-operation with other countries'.

There are hardly any references to religion and what there are glance at it indirectly. There is no hint of the writers' own faith. Probably this is as it should be. Yet in these two books there are certain postulates that Hinduism flatly repudiates. They assert or assume that nature is good and that every man ought to enjoy a modicum of its wealth. They assume too that man is free to work out his own salvation in this realm. Dr. Chand takes the value of personality for granted. Where did these postulates come from? In his last words Dr. Chand calls his fellow-countrymen to 'put a right value on (human) life'. This is to deny the fundamental Hindu doctrine of *maya*.

*Poetry for You*. By C. Day Lewis. (Blackwell, 4s. 6d.)

A cocktail, I am told, whets the appetite. Here then is a cocktail 'for Boys and Girls' — and any others who want to enjoy poetry. Mr. Lewis calls poetry 'the Cinderella of the Arts', yet it is the art in which this country has held an easy pre-eminence for centuries. The B.B.C., it seems, says that sometimes a million people listen to its poetry readings, and happily there are many poets to-day, even though they be minor ones. This is a delightful book — and thereby educational. Mr. Lewis writes out of much experience of talking in schools about poetry and he has the advantage that he himself is a poet. Here there is no sugaring of a pill, of which boys and girls are rightly suspicious, but gentle persuasion that poetry isn't a pill. To change the figure, to read his book is like taking a pleasant walk. He gives illustration after illustration, all of them apposite and none of them hackneyed. Happily he allows a very wide range to poetry. Indeed, he claims that a poet can make poetry about anything that deeply moves him. So we have here, not only the epic and the lyric, but the folk-song, the ballad, the sea-shanty, and so on. Mr. Lewis shows that even the machine is finding its way into poetry now. Occasionally one may ask questions. For instance, is it a fact or a theory that men danced before they could talk? But it was time that we had a book that leads a beginner engagingly but unerringly into the simpler of the secrets of poetry and here it is. For example, Mr. Lewis shows that rhythm is more important than metre or rhyme.

## BOOKLETS AND PAMPHLETS

What are we to do when the men come home? An answer is given in *As They Come Home* (Epworth Press, 3d.). It is the work of a Committee but owes much to Harold S. Darby. The different attitudes to religion with which the men will come back are carefully differentiated and practical suggestions follow. . . . In *The Old Corps* (Salvationist Publishing House, 2s.) Mr. Edward H. Joy (happily named!), a veteran Salvationist, recalls the early days of the Army. His book is just a galaxy of good 'yarns'. Triumph rings through story after story of the Army's mingled extravagances and persecutions. No Christian reader will escape the conviction 'Here is the work of the Spirit'. This is the very tonic for a discouraged Christian worker. Once more we say 'What hath God wrought!' The Salvation Army has now entered willy-nilly on the period when the public respects it; may it meet the inevitable perils better than the Methodists did. . . . Missionaries have long been setting themselves to see through the eyes of their converts. Now it is 'up to' the Church at home to do the same. The United Society for Christian Literature has added two volumes to its 'Africa's Own Library', both written by Africans for Africans, and therefore the more illuminating to the white man. Mr. Isaac O. Delano writes on *One Church for Nigeria* (1s. 3d.), and Mr. Max Gorvie on *Old and New in Sierra Leone* (1s. 6d.). The latter describes himself as an 'aboriginal native', for in Sierra Leone (and Liberia) there are two kinds of African — the descendants of the re-patriated slaves and the up-country tribes. Here is the first book written by one of the latter about his fatherland. It is an authoritative account of tribal customs — the warp and woof of the whole of life, every one of them dyed in religion. . . . In G. T. Bellhouse's *Letting God In*, and in G. S. Horner's *The Transformation of Adversity* (Epworth Press, 6d. each) we have two sets of Broadcast Talks, one for each week-day. It is true that each Talk costs as much as an evening paper, but then none will ever be out of date and each goes straight to its mark. . . . The new edition of *A Christian Year Book* (S.C.M., 3s. 6d.) is packed with facts, supplied by a multitude of experts, about 'Places, People, Events, Societies, Churches, and the Ecumenical Movement!' Its index shows its scope — for instance, there are entries under Apostolic Succession, Costa Rica, Girl Guides, Internees, Nestorians, Property, Secondary Schools and Söderblom, and there is a Directory of Churches, Societies and Religious Periodicals. . . . Happily there is now a great interest in Silent Worship. Here of course the Quakers are past masters. In *In Quietness* (Friends Book Centre, 2s. 6d.) Mrs. L. V. Holdsworth provides a discriminating introduction to the subject, and then collects a large number of quotations under 'The Stilling', 'The Coming', and 'The Outflowing'. This book implicitly confutes the thoughtless people who think that it is easy to wait upon God. . . . There is a growing belief that a Minister should visit his 'own people' less and outsiders more. He will find plenty of them in factories. *The Chaplain in the Factory*, by C. H. Cleal (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.) describes the best way to go about the business, for it is written by one who has done it, who has done it well, and who knows how to share his knowledge. . . . We are learning to thank the God of Nature for His gifts. 'Farm Sunday' seems not unlikely to be annually added to 'Harvest Festival'. Philip A. Wright, once a farmer and now a chaplain, has drawn up a very useful 'form of prayer for agriculture' under the title *Our Daily Bread* (Epworth Press, 2d.). . . . Literary essays are not too common nowadays. Douglas Kenmare has selected eight of his recent ones, calling the selection *The Long Pursuit* (Burrow's Press, Cheltenham, 4s. 6d.). Rilke, Hardy and D. H. Lawrence are among the subjects. . . . Erskine of Linlathen was 'an undoubted master of the spiritual life', as W. Fraser Mitchell claims in a biographical introduction to a selection from Erskine's letters and other writings which he has gathered under the title *The Purpose of Life* (Epworth Press, 1s. 6d.). Yet, like other such 'masters', he has his own *differentia*. This is a fine booklet for a reader who does not want to browse but

brood. . . . 'If at first you don't succeed — !' In *The Christian Churches and International Peace*, the Burge Lecture for 1945 (S.C.M., 1s.) the Archbishop of York first describes the failure of the various attempts of the Church 'to abolish or to restrain war' from the Middle Ages onwards, then delineates Totalitarianism under the apt name of 'The Modern Leviathan', and finally asks and answers the question 'What are we to do now?'. . . . A generation ago a chaplain of wide experience said that the line of great Christian generals ended with Gordon, but now James N. Dick, in *The Witness of Warriors* (Epworth Press, 1s.), tells us of Alexander and Montgomery, of Gort and Dobbie, and, in the other Services, of Cunningham and Gossage. Is religion dope? . . . . *Making Peace*, by Quintin Hogg (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.), belongs to 'the Christian Looks Ahead' series. In the main it is an exposition, first of the warnings of history—and not least of the history of federations—against cut-and-dried solutions, and secondly of the Prime Minister's declarations on post-war policies. Both are well done. . . . When a young Guardsman had read Mr. Cyril H. Powell's *How to be a Christian* he asked its author Nicodemus' question, 'How can these things be?' *Exploring Christianity* (Epworth Press, 2s.) is Mr. Powell's answer. It has the same practical outlook, happy illustration and winsome spirit as its predecessor. . . . The Essex Hall Lecture for 1945 was given by the Principal of Manchester College, Mr. R. Nicol Cross, under the title *Idealism and Realism* (Lindsey Press, 1s.). In the first part of the lecture Mr. Cross surveys the philosophical history of the 'marriage of Idealism with Realism', not without some tinge of Hegelianism; in the second he applies this concept to 'current problems' after the manner of a 'liberal' theologian. He has insight and pungency. Whether he is always right is another matter. . . . The Swarthmore Lecture of this year is by Wilfrid Allott and is entitled *Worship and Social Progress* (Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d. and 2s. 6d.). The marks of the booklet are a quiet catholicity, an apt choice of illustrations, and a deep insight.

The Council of Christians and Jews (21 Bloomsbury Street, W.C.1), in *A Pattern for Peace* (2d.), has issued a seven-point declaration on world-order accepted by Protestant, Roman Catholic and Jewish leaders in U.S.A., with 'the British Reply' of the Council's Committee.

#### ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

The following contractions are used: *C.Q.* for *Congregational Quarterly* (Independent Press, 10s. per annum); *E.T.* for *Expository Times* (T. & T. Clark, 1s.); *H.J.* for *Hibbert Journal* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. per annum); *H.T.R.* for *Harvard Theological Review* (Harvard Press, via Milford, \$1); *J.T.S.* for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (Milford, 10s.); *M.W.* for *The Moslem World* (Hartford Seminary Press, via Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 2s.); *P.* for *The Presbyter* (J. Clarke, 1s.); *R.L.* for *Religion in Life* (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, via Epworth Press, 9s. 6d. per annum); *S.P.* for *Studies in Philology* (University of North Carolina, \$1.25); *Y.R.* for *Yale Review* (Yale Press, via Milford, \$1). Where the title of an article does not sufficiently indicate its subject, the latter is prefixed in brackets.

'Al Azhar, Comparative Religion in', by C. C. Adams (*M.W.*, April); 'Alexander the Great, Jesus Christ and', by A. A. J. Ehrhardt (*J.T.S.*, Jan.); 'American Churches Look Ahead, The', by R. M. Fagley (*C.Q.*, April); 'American Security and Foreign Economic Policy', by Eugene V. Rostow (*Y.R.*, March); 'Apocalyptic, Miscellanea', by T. W. Manson (*J.T.S.*, Jan.); 'Arab Federation', by S. A. Morrison (*M.W.*, April); 'Arabic and Islamic Historiography', by Ilse Lichtenstadter (*M.W.*, April); 'Atoning Work of Christ in the New Testament, The', by M. S. Enslin (*H.T.R.*, Jan.); (Browning) 'A Poet Speaks to our Need', by W. Russell Bowie (*R.L.*, Spring); 'Chinese Years, Ten', by Gilbert Baker (*E.T.*, June); 'Codices Instead of Rolls, The Early

## RECENT LITERATURE

- Christian Use of', by Peter Katz (*J.T.S.*, Jan.); 'Cross of Christ, Preaching the', by John Pitts (*R.L.*, Spring); 'Donne, Logic in the Poetry of', by E. L. Wiggins (*S.P.*, Jan.); 'Ecclesia Loquax', by E. G. Rupp (*P.*, May); 'Ecclesiasticus, The Arab Text of', by L. S. Thornton (*J.T.S.*, Jan.); 'Educational Planning', by W. Fraser Mitchell (*E.T.*, June); 'Free Churches and the Future, The', by D. T. Jenkins (*P.*, May); 'Future Life, Belief in a', by J. Paul Williams (*Y.R.*, March); 'Germany, Punishing', by A. C. Ewing and C. J. Cadoux (*H.J.*, Jan.); 'Gospels, and the New Papyri, The', by H. S. Shelton (*H.J.*, Jan.); 'Healer, The Divine', by A. E. J. Rawlinson (*E.T.*, April); 'Hilasterion', by T. W. Manson (*J.T.S.*, April); 'Illyrian Churches and the Vicariata of Thessalonica, 378-395 A.D.', by S. L. Greenslade (*J.T.S.*, Jan.); 'Islam, Christendom's Cultural Debt to', by T. Cuyler Young (*M.W.*, April); 'Jacob and Joseph, the Ballad of', by Oscar Sherwin (*S.P.*, Jan.); 'James, the Epistle of St.', by W. R. Knox (*J.T.S.*, Jan.); 'Japan's Future and Our Own', by J. W. Robertson-Scott (*H.J.*, April); 'Joanna Southcott and the Panacea Society', by J. M. Swift (*E.T.*, June); 'John of the Cross and John Wesley, St.', by A. E. Taylor (*J.T.S.*, Jan.); 'Liberal Revival, The', by Elliott Dodds (*C.Q.*, April); 'Matthias, The Choice of', by L. S. Thornton (*J.T.S.*, Jan.); '(Missionaries) The Indispensable Qualification', by W. W. Miller (*M.W.*, April); 'Pagan Divine Service in Late Antiquity', by M. P. Nilsson (*H.T.R.*, Jan.); 'Palestine, Reconciliation', by E. B. Castle (*H.J.*, Jan.); 'Palestine, Reconciliation in', by Sir Wyndham Deedes (*H.J.*, April); 'Pepys, Fuller, and an Archbishop', by B. J. Whiting (*H.T.R.*, Jan.); 'Philosophy of Religion? Do We Need a', by W. R. Matthews (*H.J.*, Jan.); 'Platonic Academy of Florence, The', by Herbert L. Stewart (*H.J.*, April); 'Poetry and the Preacher, Modern', by Ronald W. Thomson (*E.T.*, March); 'Political Ideals and the Kingdom of God', by W. H. Clark (*C.Q.*, Jan.); 'Power as a Problem for Christian Thought', by J. V. L. Casserley (*E.T.*, March); 'Praying for our Enemies, On', by Stephen Hobhouse (*H.J.*, Jan.); '(Presidential Elections) The Will of the People', by Carl Becker (*Y.R.*, March); 'Press and the Pulpit, The', by A. Gordon Robins (*C.Q.*, Jan.); 'Prophecy in the Light of Recent Study, The Nature of', by H. H. Rowley (*H.T.R.*, Jan.); 'Psychotherapy and the Christian Ministry', by David E. Roberts (*R.L.*, Spring); '(Public Worship) The Setting for the Sermon', by Peter Marshall (*R.L.*, Spring); '(Religion, the Origin of) I believe', by Richard Mackenzie (*R.L.*, Spring); 'Resurrection of Jesus to the Christian Faith, The Centrality of the', by John M. Shaw (*R.L.*, Spring); '(Social Security) Food for Thought', by J. Murray and L. P. Jacks (*H.J.*, Jan.); 'Telepathy, The Implications of', by Leslie Belton (*H.J.*, April); 'Theology in a University, The Place of', by J. M. Shaw (*E.T.*, April); 'Theology, The Place of Systematic', by E. J. Price (*C.Q.*, April); 'Theology, Trends in Recent', by R. S. Franks (*C.Q.*, Jan.); 'Tintern Abbey, Autobiographical Vagaries in', by J. B. McNulty (*S.P.*, Jan.); 'Tragic Drama and the Problem of Evil', by W. Fulton (*E.T.*, May); 'Wordsworth, the Late Poets and their Contemporary Magazine Critics', by W. S. Ward (*S.P.*, Jan.).

e',  
ins  
he  
W.  
T.  
h);  
nd  
J.  
an  
de  
V.,  
he  
by  
y',  
by  
l);  
he  
ce  
by  
les  
();  
nic  
he  
the  
an  
oy  
oy  
ey  
all  
oy  
ay  
on  
();  
in  
'  
on  
ne